3860

POLITY IN THE AGNI PURĀNA

Śāstre Śabdapradhānatvamitihāseṣu niṣṭhatā Agni Purāṇa, 337.2

Dr. B. B. MISHRA

INDISCHE STUDIEN
PUNTHI PUSTAK

PUNTHI PUSTAK
CALCUTTA-4 : INDIA : 1965

UCKNOW
O
01
P

The book present, an exhaustive study of the various aspects of political and administrative organisation outlined in the *Agni Purāṇa*. Its utility has been enhanced with the comparison made with didactic portions on polity in other cotemporary Purāṇas and Sanskrit works dealing with the Subject. Epigraphic materials and the administrative history of Northern India have also been utilised. While discussing the sources, date of the final compilation and provenance of the *Agni Purāṇa*, the author has successfully established that its major portion consists of borrowings from earlier texts including *Purāṇas*, *Upapurāṇas*, *Smṛti*, *Pañcharātra* works, works on rhetoric and even from texts on medicine dealing with diseases of man as well as animal. The verses so borrowed from these sources are noted in the Appendix at the end of the book which will be of great use to scholars for critical study of the *Agni Purāṇa*, textual or otherwise.

Rs. 36.00

POLITY IN THE AGNI PURĀNA

BAMBAHADUR MISHRA, M.A., Ph.D., Dip-Pub.
Adm. & Local Govt. Government Sanskrit College,
RANCHI

राज्य संग्रहालय पुस्तकालय लखनऊ
क्र.सं 3860
प्राप्ति ति. 19.12.69
State Museum, Library, Lko.

INDISCHE STUDIEN
PUNTHI PUSTAK

PUNTHI PUSTAK
CALCUTTA-4 :: INDIA :: 1965

Published by
Sri Sankar Bhattacharya,
Punthi Pustak,
34, Mohan Bagan Lane,
Calcutta-4.

©

Thesis approved for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
Patna University, 1963

राज्य संग्रहालय लखनऊ
क्र॰ 3860
प्रा॰ तिथि 19/12/69
State Museum, Library, Lko.

3860
19.12.69

First Edition,
December, 1965

राज्य संग्रहालय पुस्तकालय लखनऊ
19/12/69

954.01
M P

Printed by
Sri J. C. Sarkhel,
Calcutta Oriental Press Private Ltd.,
9, Panchanan Ghose Lane,
Calcutta-9.

गुरुवर्यादधीतं यदनुसन्धाय तन्मुदा ।
अर्प्यते ग्रन्थकुसुमं गुरुवर्यकराब्जयोः ॥

Dedicated to Professor Ram Sharan Sharma, M.A., Ph.D., (London), as a token of deep reverence and sincere gratitude by his pupil, the author.

PREFACE

My appointment as a lecturer in the department of History and Purāṇa in the Government Sanskrit College, Ranchi, induced me to take up the present study, which could not have been completed without the encouragement and help of Professor R. S. Sharma, Head of the Department of History, Patna University. I consider it to be a great privilege to have worked under his guidance right from the beginning of my college career. The indebtedness which I owe to him can never be expressed in words. I express my deep gratitude to Dr. Yogendra Mishra, Head of the Department of History, Patna College, for his various valuable suggestions. I am much obliged to Shri S. K. Saraswati, ex-General Secretary, Asiatic Society, Calcutta, and Shri Brajadulal Chattopadhyaya, Lecturer, Burdwan University, for their help in my reading of two manuscripts of the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra*. I must thank Shri Rajeshwar Jha, Library Assistant, Bihar Research Society, for his courteous and efficient services. Dr. Dwijendra Narayan Jha, Senior Research Fellow, Patna University, helped me in procuring many books, for which I am indebted to him. My special thanks go to my younger brother Shri Krishna Ballabh Mishra for his constant assistance.

I will be failing in my duty if I do not express my deep sense of gratitude to my father-in-law Shri V. D. Mishra I.A.S. (Retd) for his financial assistance and to my wife Sm. Asha Mishra, for keeping me free to prosecute my study. I have to thank the Patna University for granting me Hathwa Raj Scholarship in History which enabled me to carry on my research at Patna when I was on leave without pay for nearly two years.

Finally, I extend my thanks to Shri Shankar Kumar Bhattacharya, proprietor of Punthi-Pustak for seeing the book through the press and the Calcutta Oriental Press for their co-operation.

In spite of my best effort many printing errors and blemishes such as different pagination of the Appendix have crept into the book for which I only crave the indulgence and sympathy of the readers.

BAMBAHADUR MISHRA

Patna, 15th December, 1965.
GOVERNMENT SANSKRIT COLLEGE,
RANCHI.

TRANSLITERATION CHART

अ	आ	इ	ई	उ	ऊ	ऋ	
a	ā	i	ī	u	ū	ṛ	
ए	ऐ	ओ	औ	ं	ः		
e	ai	o	au	ṁ	ḥ		
क	ख	ग	घ	ङ			
ka	kha	ga	gha	ṅ			
च	छ	ज	झ	ञ			
cha	chha	ja	jha	ñ			
ट	ठ	ड	ढ	ण			
ṭa	ṭha	ḍa	ḍha	ṇ			
त	थ	द	ध	न			
ta	tha	da	dha	na			
प	फ	ब	भ	म			
pa	pha	ba	bha	ma			
य	र	ल	व	श	ष	स	ह
ya	ra	la	va	śa	ṣa	sa	ha

ABBREVIATIONS

Abhilaṣi.	*Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi*
Agni	*Agni Purāṇa*
AK	*The Age of the Imperial Kanauj*
Amar	*Amarakośa*
AIHT	*Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*
Arth.	*Arthaśāstra*
Āśram	*Āśramavāsīparva*
ĀSS	Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series
AWAI	*The Art of War in Ancient India* by P. C. Chakravarti
Baudh. gṛ. śeṣa-sūtra	*Baudhāyana-gṛha-śeṣa-sūtra*
Bhand. Comm. Volume	*Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume*
Bib. Ind.	Bibliotheca Indica Series
BORI	Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
Bṛhaddharma	*Bṛhaddharma Purāṇa*
Bṛhaspati	*Bṛhaspati Smṛti*
CA	*The Classical Age*
Cal.	Calcutta
Chapt.	Chapter
Chapts.	Chapters
CHI	*Cambridge History of India,* Volume I
CII	*Corpus Inscriptionam Indicarum*
DHNI	*Dynastic History of Northern India* by H. C. Ray
EC	*Epigraphia Carnatica*
Ed.; ed.	edited or edition
EI	*Epigraphia Indica*
Eng.	English
Garuḍa	*Garuḍa Purāṇa*
Gautama	*Gautama Smṛti*
GOS	Gaekwad Oriental Series
Gūrjara Deśa.	*Glory that was Gūrjara Deśa* by K. M. Munshi
Hayaśīrṣa	*Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra*
HB	*History of Bengal,* Vol. I

HDS	*History of Dharmaśāstra*
HOS	Harvard Oriental Series
HP	Kane's *History of Sanskrit Poetics*
IA	*Indian Antiquary*
IHQ	*Indian Historical Quarterly*
JAHRS	*Journal of Andhra Historical Research Society*, Rajahmundry
JAOS	*Journal of American Oriental Society*
JASB	*Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal*
JBBRAS	*Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*
JBORS	*Journal of Bihar and Orissa Research Society*
JESHO	*Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient*
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (of Gr. Britain and Ireland)
Kathās.	*Kathāsaritsāgara*
K.E.	Kalachuri Era
K.M. Series	Kāvyamālā Series
KNS	*Kāmandaka Nītisāra* (Bombay ed. has been consulted unless noted otherwise)
KR	*Kṛtyaratnākara*
l. ll.	line, lines
Manu.	*Manu Smṛti*
Matsya.	*Matsya Purāṇa*
Mārkaṇḍeya	*Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*
Mbh.	*Mahābhārata*
Mit.	*Mitākṣarā*
Mṛchchha	*Mṛchchhakaṭika*
M. N. Dutt, *Eng. Tr.*	English Translation of the *Agni Purāṇa* by M. N. Dutt
MW	*Sanskrit-English Dictionary* by M. Monier Williams
n	note
Nārada	*Nārada Smṛti*
Nārada. Sāhasa.	*Nārada Smṛti, Sāhasaprakaraṇa*
Nāṭya.	*Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata*

NP	*Nītiprakāśikā*
NSP	Nirṇaya Sāgara Press
NVA	*Nītivākyāmṛta*
p., pp.	page, pages
Parāśara	*Parāśara Smṛti*
Pt.	Part
Purāṇic Records.	*Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs* by R. C. Hazra
qu.	quoted
Rājadharmakāṇḍa	*Kṛtyakalpataru-Rājadharmakāṇḍa*
Rāmā.	*Rāmāyaṇa*
RR	*Rājanītiratnākara*
Śānti.	*Śāntiparva*
śarīra	*śarīrasthāna*
S.E.	Śaka Era
Śiva-Vāyavīya-uttara.	*Śiva Purāṇa Vāyavīyasaṁhitā Uttarakhaṇḍa*
Śukra.	*Śukranītisāra*
Suśruta	*Suśrutasaṁhitā*
Tr.	translated
TSS	Trivendrum Sanskrit Series
Udyoga.	*Udyogaparva*
v, vv	verse, verses
Vasiṣṭha	*Vasiṣṭha Smṛti*
VDP	*Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*
V.E.	Vikrama Era
Viddhaśāla.	*Viddhaśālabhañjikā*
Viś.	Viśvarūpāchārya's text of the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti*
Viṣṇu	*Viṣṇu Smṛti*
Viṣṇu. P.	*Viṣṇu Purāṇa*
Vol.	Volume
Vṛddhahārīta	*Vṛddhahārīta Smṛti*
Yāj.	*Yājñavalkya Smṛti*
Yaśas, Yaśastilaka	*Yaśastilaka Champū* (Nirṇaya Sāgara Press edition is used unless noted otherwise)
YK or *Yukti*	*Yuktikalpataru* of Bhoja

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

PREFACE v

TRANSLITERATION CHART vii

ABBREVIATIONS ix

I INTRODUCTION 1

II SOURCES AND DATE OF FINAL COMPILATION 5

III STATE AND KINGSHIP 27

IV ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANISATION

(i) Ministers 82

(ii) Civil Administration 97

(iii) Judicial Administration 125

(iv) Local Administration 139

V REVENUE SYSTEM 148

VI ARMY AND INTER-STATE RELATIONS

(i) Army 164

(ii) Inter-State Relations 190

VII CONCLUSION 204

VIII APPENDIX 1

IX BIBLIOGRAPHY 56

X INDEX 67

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

H. H. Wilson may rightly be called the father of modern Purāṇic researches. By his systematic study of the *Purāṇas* culminating in the translation of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* with an exhaustive introduction and critical notes,[1] he drew the attention of Western scholars to the importance of the Purāṇic studies as early as the middle of the last century. But the interest created by him languished on account of the doubts raised about the historicity of the *Purāṇas*. The thread was resumed in the present century by Pargiter, who made a critical survey of the historical material of the *Purāṇas*. His two books: *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*[2] and the *Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*[3] served to stress the value of the *Purāṇas* for the reconstruction of early history. V. Smith proved that the Āndhra genealogies of the *Matsya Purāṇa* was substantially true. So the *Purāṇas* came to be regarded as a valuable source of the dynastic history of ancient India.

Till about twenty-five years ago no serious attempt worth the name was made to utilise the *Purāṇas* for the social and cultural history of India. Here the pioneering work was done by Dikshitar, who wrote two books, *Some Aspects of the Vāyu Purāṇa*[4] and *Matsya Purāṇa, A Study.*[5] In the first he discussed the cosmogony, genealogies, philosophy, music, etc., and in the second the polity and architecture. In 1935 he published an article 'Polity in the Purāṇas,'[6] in which he touched upon in four pages the political organisation as known from the *Viṣṇu, Mārkaṇḍeya* and *Agni Purāṇas*. Patil's *Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa* was a better study, though his attempt to compartmentalise the book into facts and interpretations led to much repetition. None of these studies, however, paid any attention to the determination of the dates of the various strata of the *Purāṇas* with the result that the material extracted from them could not be ascribed to any period of time. But no real progress in the field of the cultural study of the *Purāṇas* was possible till the date of their final compilation was tentatively fixed. A good beginning in dating the *Purāṇas* was made by Haraprasad Shāstrī, who discussed their probable date in *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts*.[7] Now the problem of assigning dates to the compilation of various *Purāṇas* has been largely solved by the sustained and critical studies of R. C. Hazra. His books, *Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*[8] and the *Studies in the Upapurāṇas*,[9] are significant contributions to the cultural history known from the *Purāṇas*. Other works of a similar nature are the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa: eka Sāṁskṛtika Adhyayana* by Vasudeva Saran Agrawal[10] and the *Harivaṁśa Purāṇa kā Sāṁskṛtika Vivechana* by Veenapani Pandey.[11]

---

[1] London, 1864-70
[2] Oxford, 1922, Reprinted, Delhi, 1962
[3] Oxford, 1913, Reprinted, Varanasi, 1962
[4] Madras, 1933
[5] Madras, 1935
[6] *Indian Review*, 1935, pp. 365-368

For the political ideas and administrative institutions of ancient India nearly all scholars have utilised the *Purāṇas* as a source; here we may mention K. P. Jaiswal, N. N. Law, V. R. R. Dikshitar, Beni Prasad, N. C. Bandyopadhyaya, A. S. Altekar and U. N. Ghoshal. Chapters on polity in the *Agni Purāṇa* have attracted their notice but never received adequate attention. Law describes the coronation ceremony of the *Agni Purāṇa*[12] in detail and makes some use of it in his study of the ancient Indian polity. Beni Prasad in his book *Theory of Government in Ancient India* devotes a separate chapter of seventeen pages to the polity depicted in the *Purāṇas* and the *Upapurāṇas*[13] and opines that 'politically, the *Agni Purāṇa* is one of the most important in the whole series.'[14] More than one-third of the chapter is concerned with the polity in the *Agni Purāṇa*; other *Purāṇas* such as the *Bṛhaddharma*, the *Vāyu*, the *Mārkaṇḍeya*, the *Viṣṇu*, the *Matsya*, the *Bṛhannāradīya*, the *Padma*, the *Varāha*, the *Narasiṁha*, the *Kūrma* and the *Śrīmadbhāgavata* are just touched upon. In his book *Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories* N. C. Bandyopadhyaya describes the 'political ideals in the *Purāṇas*' in seven pages, but it is really confined to the polity in the *Agni Purāṇa*. In his opinion though nearly all the *Purāṇas* contain chapters on the art of government it is only the *Agni Purāṇa* which treats it in detail.[15] The title *Political Thought in the Purāṇas*[16] written by Jagdish Lal Shastri is misleading. It only compiles texts on the *rājadharma* from the *Matsya, Agni, Mārkaṇḍeya, Garuḍa, Kālikā*, and *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇas* and summarises their ideas in thirty-two pages in English; it neither attempts any analysis of the political ideas nor puts them in their historical perspective. This has been done by Ghoshal in his book *A History of Indian Political Ideas*[17]. He critically examines the Purāṇic political ideas and divides them into two groups; those collected from the early *Mahāpurāṇas*[18], and those from the late *Mahāpurāṇa*[19] such as the *Matsya*, the *Agni*, the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, etc. Ghoshal makes some use of the *Agni* in his exposition of the underlying theories and ideas, but he does not deal with the administrative apparatus envisaged in the various *Purāṇas*.

---

[7] Vol. V (Purāṇa Manuscripts), Calcutta, 1928
[8] Dacca, 1940
[9] Calcutta, 1958
[10] Allahabad, 1961
[11] Prakāśana Śākhā, Sūchanā Vibhāga, Uttarpradesh, 1960
[12] *Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity*, Oxford, 1921, pp. 197-203
[13] *Theory of Government in Ancient India*, pp. 185-201
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 187

So many modern writers have referred to the views of the *Agni Purāṇa* in their books on ancient Indian polity, but their treatment has been sketchy, and, in the absence of any attempt at provisionally dating this text, uncritical. So far as the administrative system outlined in the *Agni Purāṇa* is concerned, even this scant treatment of the subject is not available.

No study of the political thought of the *Agni Purāṇa* can be fruitful unless it is correlated to the age in which this work was compiled. Since the time of Wilson attempts have been made by scholars to fix the date of its compilation. P. V. Kane[20] has assigned dates to its chapters on literary criticism and judicial administration. Some scholars have tried to re-examine the date assigned to it by Kane and S. K. De. Hoernle has tried to fix the date of the chapters on medicine with special reference to their contents relating to osteology. S. B. Choudhury[21] has made a general analysis of the chapters of the *Agni Purāṇa* and ascribed the whole work to the second half of the eighth and the first half of the ninth century. Thus the dating of the *Agni Purāṇa* has engaged the attention of many scholars, but the views of Haraprasad Shāstrī and R. C. Hazra on the subject deserve special consideration. In the present study we have followed up their lines of inquiry by trying to fix the dates of the varied contents of the *Agni Purāṇa* and find out whether they converge on any point to suggest the date of the work as a whole. This has been done in the context of the dates of compilation of the sources from which our *Purāṇa* has freely borrowed. We have also examined the internal evidence of the text to determine its provenance.[22]

---

[15] *Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories*, Calcutta. 1938, Vol. II, p. 362

[16] Lahore, 1944

[17] Oxford Press, 1959

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 326-336

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 438-448

[20] *HP*, 1951, pp. 3-10; *HDS*. Vol. I. p. 172; For S. K. De's view see *JRAS*, 1923, pp. 537-549

[21] *JAHRS*, III, pp. 127-134.

The major part of our work deals with the system of government delineated in the *Agni Purāṇa*. We have examined its views on the traditional theory of the seven limbs of the state, and the institution of kingship, the educational and other qualifications of the king, his daily routine, duties and functions, and privileges. Ministers and other high functionaries have been treated in a similar way. The civil, judicial, local, and revenue administration have been dealt with in some detail. The organisation of the army, the causes of war, and principles of inter-state relations have been discussed at some length. In short, we have tried to present a full picture of the administrative organisation recommended by the *Agni Purāṇa*. In doing so we have taken account of the relevant material supplied by contemporary literary and epigraphic sources so that it may be possible to place the results of our study in their proper historical setting.

---

22 ĀSS of the *Agni Purāṇa* is the base of our study.

CHAPTER II

SOURCES AND DATE OF THE FINAL COMPILATION

The *Agni Purāṇa*, widely known as a *mahāpurāṇa*, suggests three broad stages of development: first, befitting its name, as stated by the *Śiva-rahasyakhaṇḍa* of the *Skanda Purāṇa* and the *Matsya*, it originated as a composition in praise of Agni (god of fire),[1] second, as its internal evidence shows, it became a vaiṣṇava *Purāṇa* and incorporated vaiṣṇava *Pañcharātra*, chapters on *vedānta*, the *Gītā*, etc.; and third, it included *Śaivāgama*, obscene tāntric rituals, etc. and came to be condemned by the vaiṣṇavite *Padma Purāṇa*[2] as a *tāmasa Purāṇa* leading to hell.

Hazra,[3] after a careful analysis of the characteristics of the *Agni Purāṇa* as given in other texts, holds that originally it praised Agni as the highest deity and dealt with the sacrificial rites and conduct of *āhitāgni* brāhmaṇas and so was specially meant for them. It was also concerned with the *Iśāna-kalpa*. In Hazra's opinion the *Agni Purāṇa* spoken out by Agni to Vasiṣṭha consisted of sixteen thousand verses.

Let us see how far the characteristics of the original *Agni Purāṇa* apply to the text we have consulted. Though recast drastically, it contains some verses in praise of Agni. In the opening chapter Agni is represented as Viṣṇu, Kālāgni and Rudra.[4] The same idea is repeated in chapter 174, where it is stated that Viṣṇu has two forms one of which, Agni, is praised in the *Agni Purāṇa*. It adds that the *Vedas* are unanimous in holding that Fire is the supreme soul and the mouth of the gods.[5] It is further stated that Agni is but the manifestation of Viṣṇu, and he is meditated upon, worshipped, remembered, praised and respected because he destroys all sins.[6] So we may conclude that these two chapters of our text have at least some traces of its old character and so are earlier in composition. But the opening verse of our text includes an invocation to Gaṇeśa, a practice first found in the *Mālatīmādhava*, a work of the eighth century A. D. In this very chapter, which we think to be earlier one, our text claims to present a gist of all branches of learning (*vidyāsāra*).[7] Hazra rightly suggests that 'the chapters on the different branches of learning belonged to the present *Agni Purāṇa* in its earliest form, and that they were put together to constitute the *Purāṇa* at the same time.'[8]

---

[1] Vaṅgavāsi ed. *Saṁkarasaṃhitā*, 2. 30-35 ; Matsya, 53.68

[2] ĀSS, *Uttarakhaṇḍa*, 263. 81-85

[3] "Studies in the genuine *Āgneya-Purāṇa* alias *Vahni-Purāṇa*" (*Our Heritage*, Vol. I, p. 213)

[4] *Ibid.*, 1.13.

[5] *Ibid.*, 174.13 : *dvīvidyārūpako viṣṇuragnirūpastu gīyate.*
paramātmā devamukhaṁ sarvavedeṣu gīyate :
271.15 : *agnirūpeṇa devādermukhaṁ viṣṇuḥ parā gatiḥ.*

[6] *Ibid.*, 174.14-15.

Another attribute of the early *Purāṇa*, the interlocution between Agni and Vasiṣṭha, is also found in our text but not always. It, however, neither refers to the *Iśāna-Kalpa* nor to the sacrificial rites of the *āhitāgni* brāhmaṇas. As for the number of verses contained in it, the *Agni Purāṇa* records two traditions. In chapter 272 it states that it contains twelve thousand verses[9] and in its last chapter it claims to contain fifteen thousand verses[10] though it actually possesses 11457. So it is apparent that our text underwent several additions. In order to arrive at a probable date of its compilation, we have to date interpolations made in the present *Agni Purāṇa*, a course adopted by Hazra in fixing the date of the *Purāṇas*.[11]

The *Agni Purāṇa* claims to be an epitome of all branches of knowledge[12], classified into *parā* and *aparā*. The *parā* is the knowledge of the Supreme, and the *aparā* that of the *Vedas*, their six-fold limbs, lexicography (*abhidhāna*), *nyāya* and the *mīmāṁsā*, the *dharmaśāstra*, the *Purāṇas* and the four *Upavedas*, science of medicine (*āyurveda*). music (*gāndharvaveda*), military science (*dhanurveda*) and the science of worldly affairs (*arthaśāstra*),[13]. So the compiler of our text intends to impart the essence of all the worldly as well as divine knowledge which may help the people to achieve success in this life and salvation in the next. Its last chapter contains a list of the following fifty topics, which are discussed in its body:—(i) ten incarnations of Viṣṇu, (ii) summary of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, (iii) summary of the *Harivaṁśa*, (iv) summary of the *Mahābhārata*, (v) the *Vaiṣṇavāgama*, (vi) worship, (vii) initiation (*dīkṣā*),

---

[7] *Ibid.*, 1.12.

[8] *Purāṇic Records.*, p. 137.

[9] *Agni*, 272.10-11 : *dvādaśaiva sahasrāṇi sarvavidyāvabodhanam.*

[10] *Ibid.*, 383.64. But the variants found in other manuscripts enumerate even fourteen or twelve thousand verses as its contents.

[11] *Purāṇic Records.*, 137.

[12] *Agni*, 1.12: *vidyāsāraṁ yadviditvā sarvajño jāyate naraḥ* ; 1.3, 271.17-18: *sarvavedamaya, sarvavidyāmaya, sarvajñānamaya.*

[13] *Ibid.*, 1. 15-17, 383. 2-4. The second list omits *kalpa* and adds *vedānta.*

(viii) consecration of images, (ix) installation of images, (x) iconography, (xi) architecture, (xii) spells and charms, (xiii) the *Śaivāgama*, (xiv) Śākta-worship, (xv) sun-worship, (xvi) dissolution, (xvii) the description of the creation, (xviii) geography, (xix) description of Tīrthas such as Gayā, Gaṅgā and Prayāga, (xx) astronomy, (xxi) astrology, (xxii) astrology and rituals conferring victory in war, (xxiii) various aeons of Manu, (xxiv) rules of caste and stage (*varṇāśramadharma*), (xxv) impurity (*aśaucha*), (xxvi) purification of a thing (*dravyaśuddhi*), (xxvii) expiation (*prāyaśchitta*), (xxviii) the duty of the king (*rājadharma*), (xxix) gifts, (xxx) different vows (*vrata*), (xxxi) law code (*vyavahāra*), (xxxii) propitiary rituals according to the four *Vedas*, (xxxiii) description of the solar dynasty, (xxxiv) description of the lunar dynasty, (xxxv) military science (*dhanurveda*), (xxxvi) medicine (*āyurveda*), (xxxvii) music (*gāndharvaveda*), (xxxviii) polity (*arthaśāstra*), (xxxix) *mīmāṁsā* philosophy, (xl) *nyāya* philosophy, (xli) the various *Purāṇas* and their praise (*māhātmya*), (xlii) metrics, (xliii) grammar, (xliv) rhetoric, (xlv) lexicography, (xlvi) phonetics (*śikṣā*), (xlvii) *kalpa*, (xlviii) dissolution, (xlix) *vedānta* philosophy. and (l) the eight-fold *yoga*.[14] The *Agni Purāṇa* further states that nothing can be richer in substance than this *Purāṇa*[15]. It expresses its indebtedness to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Harivaṁśa*, but not to the other sources used by it.

For a convenient discussion of the sources and the dates of the interpolations made into the *Agni Purāṇa*, we may classify the three hundred and eighty-three chapters of our *Purāṇa* under these broader heads: (i) the incarnations of Viṣṇu; (ii) the five essentials of a *Purāṇa*, creation, dissolution, dynasties of sages and kings, aeons of different Manus and the cosmological and geographical description of the creation; (iii) consecration, iconography, worship of different gods and principles of architecture; (iv) astrology; (v) social rites and customs or the *smṛti* materials; (vi) various types of fasts and gifts; (vii) polity; (viii) medicines; (ix) metrics; (x) rhetoric, grammar, lexicography; (xi) *vedānta* and the *yoga* philosophy. Now we may consider the date of each one of these subjects inserted in the *Agni Purāṇa*.

The seven chapters dealing with the Rāma incarnation of Viṣṇu form a summary of the seven *kāṇḍas* of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, each chapter standing for one *kāṇḍa*.[16] The story contained in them closely conforms to the original source and reminds us of a similar precis done by Kālidāsa in the *Raghuvaṁśa*, by the *Garuḍa*, the *Padma* and other *Purāṇas*. Our text summarises the *Harivaṁśa*[17] in one chapter and out of seventeen verses of the chapter 17, eleven and a half verses are quoted *verbatim* from the second chapter of the *Harivaṁśa*. The whole story of the *Mahābhārata* is compressed in three chapters of our text.[18] Because of the religious character of these three texts, our *Purāṇa* makes no secret of the fact that they are summarised by it.

---

[14] *Ibid.*, 383. 52-63

[15] *Ibid.*, 383. 48: *nāsmāt paratarah sāro. ..*

[16] *Ibid.*, chapts. 5-11.

Hazra analyses the chapters dealing with the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu and suggests that they were possibly included in the ninth century. He bases his inference on the following grounds:—

(i) Though the list of ten incarnations headed by the Fish was known early, it attained general acceptance not before A.D. 800.

(ii) The mention of the Bauddhas and the Arhatas as heretics (*pāṣaṇḍins*) and of the *mlechchhas* as kings probably refers to the Muslims, who came to India about the ninth century A.D.[19]

Chapter 15 of the *Agni Purāṇa*, which deals with the Pāṇḍavas journey to heaven, seems unnecessary and spurious because with the description of the death of the Pāṇḍavas the story should have ended. This chapter is added only after the insertion of the *Svargārohaṇa Parva* in the *Mahābhārata*, some portion of which itself according to Hazra is spurious and a later addition.[20]

In support of Hazra's view we may add that the verse *'rāmarāvaṇayoryuddhaṁ rāmarāvaṇayoriva*' of the *Agni Purāṇa*[21] may have borrowed the idea from the *Raghuvaṁśa*, although it is not a total borrowing according to H. P. Shāstri.[22] It is cited as an example of *ananvaya alaṁkāra* by Vāmana[23] and by the philosopher Sureśvara in his *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad Bhāṣyavārtika*.[24] As our text borrows from Vāmana, who flourished about A.D. 800, it is obvious that the crucial passage of the *Rāmāyaṇa*[24a] was incorporated after this date. Thus the

---

17 *Ibid*,, chapt. 1.2

18 *Ibid*., chapts. 13-15.

19 *Purāṇic Records*., pp. 88-89

20 *Ibid*., p. 3.

21 10. 23

22 *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, Vol. V, Calcutta, 1928, preface, p. cxlviii ; *Raghuvaṁśa*, 12. 87
anyonyadarśanaṁ prāpta vikramāvasaraṁ chirāt,
rāmarāvaṇayoryuddhaṁ charitārthamivābhavat.

23 *Kāvyālaṁkārasūtra*, Kāvyamālā Series, Bombay, 1926, IV, 3-14.

24 Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, 1951, p. 139n.

24a *Laṅkā-Kāṇḍa*, 109.24.

chapters 2-16, dealing with the incarnations of Viṣṇu, belong to the ninth century A.D. The chapters 17-20, 272-278, and 368, which describe the five essentials of a *Purāṇa*, are older and borrowed from the *Viṣṇu*, the *Vāyu*, the *Matsya* and the *Harivaṁśa Purāṇas*.

The *Agni Purāṇa* claims to give a summary of the Vaiṣṇava and the Śaiva tantras (*āgamas*), Śākta and sun worship, and describes the consecration of images, initiation rituals, iconography, architecture, town-planning and other allied matters.[25] These subjects are primarily covered by chapters 21-106, 201 and 317-326, their total number being ninety-seven. If we analyse these chapters we find that chapter 201, dealing with the worship of an image in nine circles, is not at its proper place. The chapters preceding it speak of various fasts and penances, and those succeeding it deal with flowers, various hells, observance of fast for a month, *bhīṣmapañchakavrata*, offering to Agastya, *kaumudavrata* and gifts in continuation with fasts. So the chapters 201-203 do not fit in the context in which they are placed. Chapter 201 abruptly introduces an interlocution between Nārada and Hari, and deals with the *pañcharātra* worship of Vāsudeva, Saṁkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, Aniruddha and Nārāyaṇa. It should have been somewhere between chapters 21-106, which deal with similar topics. Chapters 21-106 seem to be derived from four sources and can be divided into four groups:

(i) In chapters 21-30 Nārada is the chief interlocutor.

(ii) In chapters 31-38 Agni is the interlocutor.

(iii) In chapters 39-70 Hayagrīva and Bhagavāna are interlocutors.

(iv) In chapters 71-106 Īśvara (Śiva) speaks to Skanda about the worship of Śiva, Śakti, sun, the followers (*gaṇa*) of Śiva and the other members of his family.

It may be noted that in chapters 317-326 Īśvara again speaks to Skanda about the various spells, the worship of Śiva's *gaṇas*, Vāgīśvarī, making of different circles (*maṇḍala*) for worship, propitiation of Aghora, Pāśupata, Rudra and Gaurī. Apparently chapters 21-30 are imbued with the *pañcharātra* ideals and prescribe the worship of Vāsudeva, Saṁkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, Aniruddha and Nārāyaṇa,[26] but the word *pañcharātra* is nowhere mentioned. These are borrowed from an earlier *Nārada Pañcharātra* or from some celebrated *pañcharātra* work in which Nārada is the chief interlocutor. Similarly, chapters 31-38 and 39-70 are adopted from other *pañcharātra* work. Chapters 31-38 are later than chapters 21-30 because

---

[25] *Agni*, 383. 53-55.

[26] *Ibid.*, 25, 1-2

(i) they give more prominence to the preceptor (*guru*),[27]
(ii) speak of the Viṣṇu's circle (*pārṣada*),[28]
(iii) lay down the ways for initiation into Vaiṣṇavism.[29]
(iv) are more influenced by Tantricism,[30]
(v) refer to the destroyers of holy temples,[31] or possibly the Muslims, and
(vi) mention the *bhāgavatas*.[32]

Chapters 39-70 of the *Agni Purāṇa* enumerate twenty-five *pañcharātra* works and also refers to the *saptarātra* sect.[33] The origin, development and the principles of the *saptarātras* are not indicated.[34] However, the *Agni Purāṇa* summarises the first two *kāṇḍas* of the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra*, the *ādikāṇḍa* and the *saṁkarṣaṇa kāṇḍa*;[35] in the absence of the *liṅga* and the *saura*, it cannot be conclusively said that the chapters 46-47, 50-52 and 54 in which the interlocutor is the same Bhagavāna, and chapters 71-106 belong to the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra*. One of the verse, 5(b)-6(a) of chapter 46 occurs in the *Viṣṇurahasya*, as quoted in the *Āchāramayūkha*.[36] So these chapters of the *Agni Purāṇa* seem to have been incorporated after the composition of the *Viṣṇurahasya* and the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra*. As the former is rejected by Vallālasena[37] as a mere compilation, it is possible that the *Agni Purāṇa* and the

---

[27] *Ibid.*, 33. 45-46.

[28] *Ibid.*, 33.57: *viṣṇupārṣadebhyo...*

[29] *Ibid.*, 34. 32: *vaiṣnavīkaraṇaṁ...*

[30] *Ibid.*, chapt. 33.

[31] *Ibid.*, 38. 36.

[32] *Ibid.*, 38. 39: *yatra bhāgavatā loke tachchittāstatparāyaṇdḥ.*

[33] *Ibid.*, 39. 1-5. It is to be noted that the *Agni Purāṇa* intends to give the gist of the twenty-five texts belonging to the *pañcharātras*.

[34] Tarapada Bhattacharya tries to identify the cult of the *saptarātras* with that of Brahmā but his arguments are unconvincing. ('The Cult of Brahmā', *JBRS*, XLI, Pt. I, pp. 17-18).

[35] I have been able to go through the *ādikāṇḍa* which has already been published and the two manuscripts preserved in the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, which contain only the *ādikāṇḍa* and the *saṁkarṣaṇakāṇḍa*. No other manuscript of the text is available in India.

[36] p. 101.

[37] *Dānasāgara*, ed. Bhabatosh Bhattacharya, Bib. In. Calcutta. 1956, pp. 6-7.

Viṣṇurahasya utilized a common source but it certainly took place before Vallālasena. D. C. Bhattacharya[38] tentatively fixes the date of the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra* about A. D. 800, but our own analysis points to a still later date. We find that the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra* forbids the brāhmaṇas of Kachchha, Kāverī, Koṅkaṇa, Kāmarūpa, Kaliṅga, Kāñchī, Kāśmīra, Kośala and Mahārāṣṭra to officiate at the consecration of images.[39] An identical list with the exclusion of Mahārāṣṭra is found in the Pīṅgalamata, a supplement to the *Brahmayāmala* and connected with the *Śiraśchheda-jayadrathayāmala.*[40] Moreover, the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra* recommends that the manuscripts of the *Pañcharātras,* the *Purāṇas,* the *Mahābhārata,* etc., should be transcribed in the *Nāgara* and the *Śāradā* scripts,[41] whose beginnings may enable us to throw some light on the date of this text. The *Nāgara* script is not included in the eighteen scripts referred to by Jain *sūtras*[42] or in the sixty-four scripts enumerated by the *Lalitavistara.*[43] The first inscription in the *Nāgara* script is dated in A.D. 754,[44] and the earliest epigraphic reference to this script occurs in a Hoysala inscription of A.D. 1290, where the same salary is prescribed for a teacher of any *Veda* or for one who makes the boys read the *Nāgara,* the *Kannaḍa,* the *Tigula* (Tamila) or the *Ārya* (Marāṭhī) scripts.[45] It shows that an attempt was made to popularise these scripts at least in this area towards the end of the thirteenth century. Ojha states that the *Nāgarī* script came to be used in northern India in the early tenth century.[46] Bühler thinks that 'northern *Nāgarī* was in use at least since the beginning of the eighth century and in the eleventh century the script became paramount in nearly all the districts north of the Narmadā'.[47] Similarly the *Śāradā* script was not popular in Kāśmīra till the eighth century, and the

---

38 Foreword to *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra,* Vol. I. ed. Bhuvan Mohan Sāṅkhya-tīrtha, Varendra Research Society, Rajashahi, 1952.

39 *Ibid.,* I. 3. 3-4.

40 Bagchi, P. C. 'On some Tantrik texts studied in Ancient Kambuja', *IHQ,* V, p, 708. D. C. Bhattacharya is wrong in ascribing the exclusion of these brāhmaṇas to their belief in Śākta and Saiva systems, as the text referred to above declares the brāhmaṇas of these countries unfit because of the physical deformities of the people of these countries.

41 *Hayaśīrṣa,* Chapt 31, fol. 97(a)-101(a).

42 Pandey, Rajabali, *Indian Palaeography,* p. 52

43 Bib. Ind., Chapter 10, p. 143.

44 Barnett, L. D. *Antiquities of India,* London, 1913, p. 226

45 *EC,* III, No. 27 ; *HDS,* Vol. II. Pt. I, p. 355.

46 Ojha. G. H. *Bhāratīya Prāchīnalipimālā,* second ed. 1918. p. 69

47 Bühler, G. *Indian Paleography,* Indian Studies. Past and Present, Calcutta.

earliest epigraph in this script is dated in *circa* tenth century.[48] In the light of the dates of the *Nāgara* and the *Śāradā* scripts the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra* should be assigned to the first half of the tenth century, and the *Agni Purāṇa*,[49] which borrows extensively from the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra* to the second half of the tenth or possibly to the first half of the eleventh century.

Our inference is supported by other facts too. First, our *Purāṇa* debars Kāśmīra brāhmaṇas from officiating at the consecration ceremony of images, as is done by the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra*,[50] and omits the *Śāradā* script for transcribing holy scriptures.[51] This double exclusion suggests that the brāhmaṇas of Kāśmīra and their script were held in low esteem by the compiler of the *Agni Purāṇa*. This may be linked up with the immoral practices in Kāśmīra during the rule of Kṣemagupta and his wife Diddā in the tenth century.[52] Perhaps the impious rule of Diddā led the compiler of our text to scorn the idea of living in a country ruled by a woman.[53]

The *Agni Purāṇa* dwells upon the iconography of sixty-four Yoginīs,[54] who are a type of tāntric goddesses and can be traced not before the eighth century. According to H. D. Bhattacharya their number rose from seven or eight to sixty-four in the early medieval period. The first sacred shrine dedicated to them was the temple of sixty-four Yoginīs at Bherāghāṭa built by Yuvarājadeva I (c. A. D. 915-947) of the later Kalachuri dynasty. A little later we have such temples built at Khajuraho, Ranipur-Jural, Coimbatore and Kalahandi.[55] The *Yoginī Tantra* is assigned to the tenth century A D., which supports our view that the chapters of the *Agni Purāṇa* on architecture, iconography and worship belong to that century.

Chapters 71-106 begin with the worship of Gaṇeśa and deal primarily with the worship of Śiva along with his retinue; the interlocutors are

---

48 Ojha, G. H. *op. cit.*, p. 73.

49 The *Agni Purāṇa* knows the full development of the *Nāgarī* script as it refers to fifty letters. (313.34, 319.3).. Hsüan Tsang knows a script of forty-seven letters only. *Travels of Hiouen-Thsang.* Vol. II, p. 135.

50 *Agni*, 39, 6-7.

51 *Ibid.*, 63, 5 ; cf. *Hayaśīrsa.*, fol. 49(b):
kāśmīre nāgarervarṇera samaśīrṣe śubhāsanaiḥ.

52 *DHNI*, Vol. I, pp. 130-136

53 *Agni*, 155.24.

54 *Ibid.*, chapt. 52.

55 *AK*, pp. 341-342.

Śiva and Skanda.[56] They refer to the *Śivasaṁhitā*,[57] the *Saṁhitāmantra*,[58] mention the *Saṁhitā* thrice,[59] and also those who are expert in *Saṁhitā*.[60] The books on *Siddhānta*[61] are known to our compiler, who is also aware of *śivaśāstra*,[62] *śivamantra*,[63] and *āgamas*.[64] These contents suggest a borrowing by the compiler of our text from some book on *Śaivāgama*; perhaps the chapters 71-106 are taken from the *Liṅga* and the *Saura Kāṇḍas* of the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra*. Further, mention of mercury in connection with the consecration of images[65] indicates some date in the 9th-10th centuries, for mercury came into use only after the Arab invasion of India.[66]

Though Alice Getty states that Gaṇeśa is a primitive deity, no invocations are made to him in the beginning of any text before the eighth century.[67] The *Agni Purāṇa* offers prayers to Gaṇeśa in its opening verse; the chapters 71-106, evidently adopted from another text, begin with the worship of this deity and enumeration of his fourteen names, and chapters 317-326 represent Gaṇeśa as an elephant-headed tāntric god. It appears that all these chapters are contemporaneous with one another and are later than chapters 21-70. Hazra also holds that these were incorporated after the ninth century.[68]

Chapters 121-149 of our *Purāṇa* relate to astrology, astronomy and the branch of astrology leading to the king's victory in the battlefield. Even a superficial analysis indicates that our text owes these chapters to two earlier sources; in chapters 121-123 the interlocutor Agni claims to abridge a treatise on astrology containing four lacs of verses, and in chapters 124-149 Īśvara speaks to Devī about astrology, the science of gaining victory in war and various types of spells. Chapters (121-123) on astrology seem to be of the post-Gupta period. They describe the auspicious and inauspicious asterisms for perforating the ears of a child (*karṇavedha*),[69] which is referred to only in late *dharmaśāstra* literature such as the law-books of Bṛhaspati and Vyāsa and the *Baudhāyana gṛha-śeṣa-sūtra*.[70] Hsüan Tsang is probably the first foreign traveller to describe this practice.[71] These chapters also lay down the auspicious time for taking betel-leaves,[72] which came into wide use in the Gupta period.

---

[56] *Agni*, chapt. 71.

[57] *Ibid.*, 72.26.

[58] *Ibid.*, 97.86.

[59] *Ibid.*, 75.9, 78.46, 78.48.

[60] *Ibid.*, 90.14.

[61] *Ibid.*, 78.66, 79.30.

[62] *Ibid.*, 102.4

[63] *Ibid.*, 101.12.

[64] *Ibid.*, 82.25

[65] *Ibid.*, 95.59.

[66] Basham, A. L. *The Wonder that was India*, London, 1956, p. 498.

[67] *Supra*. Dikshitar holds the cult of Gaṇeśa to be an innovation of Mahārāṣṭra in the sixth century A. D. (*Gupta Polity*, Madras University, 1952, pp. 315-316).

[68] *Purāṇic Records*., pp. 136 and 185-186

Certain other chapters (224-249) on astrology denote a still later date. First, they enumerate the twelve *rāśis* of the sun,[73] first mentioned in the law code of Yājñavalkya. Second, the order of the twenty-seven asterisms begins from Aśvinī to Revatī, which shows the astronomy of the third stage according to Barnett. This order of enumeration does not occur in any text before the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*.[74] Third, the *Agni Purāṇa* discusses the astrological factors leading to the rise and fall in the price of a material (*arghakāṇḍa*), and also describes the four circles (*maṇḍala*) as Varāhamihira does, but its treatment is quite different from that of Varāhamihira.[75] The compiler of our text neither accepts the view of Varāhamihira, nor agrees with the view of Garga and Parāśara, quoted by Utpala, the eighth century commentator on the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*.

The *Agni Purāṇa* enumerates the four circles of asterisms, the *āgneya*, the *vāyavya*, the *varuṇa* and the *māhendrā*.[76] Each circle contains the same asterisms as we find in the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*[77] but prediction of their results are different here. Varāhamihira discusses these circles in connection with the prior symptoms of an earthquake, but our text connects them with gaining victory in war.[78] Further, according to Varāhamihira[79] the *āgneya* circle badly affects the people of Aśmaka, Vāhlīka, Taṅgaṇa, Kaliṅga, Vaṅga, and the Draviḍas and the Śabaras, and gives rise to various diseases, loss of rain and mutual strife among the kings. But according to the *Agni Purāṇa* it leads to loss of milk, flower and fruits, and a wholesale destruction of crops due to lack of rains, eventually causing famine; moreover, it brings about the destruction of the seven countries constituting the Uttarāpatha, Saindhavas, Yāmunās, Gurjara, Bhoja, Bāhlīka, Jālaṁdhara, and Kāśmīra.[80] The *vāyavya* circle, according to our *Purāṇa*, totally destroys the people of Ḍāhala, Kāmarūpa, Kaliṅga, Kośala, Ayodhyā, Avantī, Koṅkaṇa and Āndhra,[81] but according to Varāhamihira it causes troubles to the people of Saurāṣṭra, Kuru, Magadha, Daśārṇa and Matsya.[82] He further states that the *varuṇa* circle results in heavy rain and the destruction of Gonarda, Chedi, Kukura, Kirātas, and Vaidehakas.[83] But according to our text it brings about abundance of edibles, cheap prices of land produce, and a fierce fight among the kings.[84] According to it, the *māhendra* circle leads to the general happiness of people and a treaty of peace among the warring kings,[85] on the other hand in the opinion of Varāhamihira this destroys the kings and the republics (*gaṇapa*), and causes trouble to the people of Kāśī, Yugandharas, Pauravas, Kirātas, Kīras, Ābhisāras, Halas, Madras, Arvudas, Surāṣṭras and the Mālavas.[86] Taken together the effects of the four circles of asterisms, as described by our *Purāṇa*, imply a devastating famine in North-Western India as a result of severe drought; destruction of Ḍāhala, Kāmarūpa, Kaliṅga, Kośala, Ayodhyā, Avantī, Koṅkaṇa and the Āndhra country; fierce battle among the kings; and finally a treaty of peace. The idea of truncated Uttarāpatha with the exclusion of many countries and tribes described by Rājaśekhara,[87] reference to Gurjara as a country, and prominence of Ḍāhala are very suggestive. The earliest reference to Gurjara is found in the *Harṣacharita* of Bāṇa.[88] Ḍāhala came into prominence in the early medieval period under the Kalachuris, and the area of the Uttarāpatha shrunk as a result of the Muslim invasion. The political condition described by the *Agni Purāṇa* in these regions refers probably to the state of affairs in the tenth and early eleventh century.

---

[69] *Agni*, 121.9 and 25.

[70] Bṛhaspati as quoted in the *Saṁskāraprakāśa*, p. 258 ; *Vyāsa*, 1.14-15 and 18 ; *Baudh*, *gṛ. śeṣa-sūtra*, I. 12.

[71] *Travels of Hiouen-Thsang*, Vol. II, p. 134.

[72] *Agni*, 121.11.

[73] *Ibid.*, chapt. 130.

[74] *Ibid.*, 136.7-8 ; Barnett, *Antiquities of India*, Calcutta, p. 212 ; Hazra, *Studies in the Upapurāṇas*, Vol. I, p. 209.

[75] *Ibid.*, chapts. 129-130 ; cf. *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, Vol. I, chapts, 32 and 41.

[76] *Ibid.*, chapt. 130.

[77] Vol. I, chapt. 32

[78] *Agni.*, 130.1

[79] *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, 32.12-15.

---

[80] *Agni*, 130.2-8.
[81] *Ibid.*, 130.8-11.
[82] *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, 32.8-11.
[83] *Ibid.*, 32.20-22.
[84] *Agni*, 130.12-14.
[85] *Ibid.*, 130.15-17.
[86] *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, 32.16-19.
[87] Rājaśekhara enumerates twenty-one countries of Uttarāpatha such as Śaka, Kekaya, Bokkāṇa, Hūṇa, Baṇāyuja, Kāmboja, Bāhlīka, Vahlava, Liṁpāka, Kulūta, Kīra, Taṁgaṇa, Tuṣāra, Turuṣka, Barbara, Harahūraba, Huhuka, Sahuḍa, Haṁsamārga, Ramaṭha and Karakaṇṭha. (*Kāvyamīmāṁsā*, Patna, 1954, chapt. 17, p. 227).
[88] *Gūrjara Deśa*, Vol. I, p. 3 ; Puri, B. N. *The History of the Gurjara-Pratihāras*, Bombay, 1957, p. 9.

The chapters on astrology in the *Agni Purāṇa* also betray a deep tantric influence, for they describe the six-fold purpose, killing (*māraṇa*), stupefying (*mohana*), maddening (*uchchāṭana*), bringing others under control (*vaśīkaraṇa*), controlling the functions of others (*stambhana*) and causing loss of friendship among others (*vidrāvaṇa*),[89] and the six types of *tantra*[90] such as *pallava*, *yogākhya*, *rodhaka*, *saṁpuṭa*, *prathama* and *vidarbha*. The tāntric goddesses Kubjıkā, Bhelkhi, Tārā, Tvaritā, Chaṇḍaghaṇṭā, Karālī, Sumukhī, Durmukhī, Ajitā, Aparājitā,[91] etc. are described together with obscene and horrifying rituals.[92] These chapters on astrology could not have been interpolated before the ninth century, for no work on the science of gaining victory in war is known before Utpala, the commentator of the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, who flourished in the eighth century.

The *Agni Purāṇa* mentions the law-books of twenty writers, (i) Manu, (ii) Viṣṇu, (iii) Yājñavalkya, (iv) Vasiṣṭha, (v) Hārīta, (vi) Atri, (vii) Yama, (viii) Aṅgirā, (ix) Dakṣa (x) Saṁvarta, (xi) Śātātapa, (xii) Parāśara, (xiii) Āpastamba, (xiv) Uśanasa, (xv) Vyāsa, (xvi) Kātyāyana, (xvii) Bṛhaspati, (xviii) Gautama, (xix) Śaṅkha, and (xx) Likhita[93] and derives its *smṛti* material from them. Strangely our text does not refer to Nārada and Devala,[94] whose verses are quoted by it. Its treatment of the forty-eight *saṁskāras* is the same as in the *Gautama Dharmasūtra*.[95] But the major portion of the *smṛti* material of the *Agni Purāṇa* is taken from the *Viṣṇudharmottara*.[96] In our view the chapters borrowed from the law-books of Nārada and Devala, and from the *Viṣṇudharmottara* are later than those taken from the earlier law-books, and according to Hazra[97] these should be assigned to the ninth century.

[89] *Agni.*, 125.43

[90] *Ibid.*, chapt. 138

[91] *Ibid.*, 125.2-13

[92] *Ibid.*, chapts. 133-134 ; 134.2 ; *vasāmedoviliptagātre* 135.1 : ... *rudhirmāṁsamadyapriye* ; 146.6 : *māṁsasoṇitasurāsavapriye* ... ; 125.51 ; *śmaśāne niśi kāṣṭāgnau nagne muktaśikho naraḥ.*

[93] *Agni*, 162.1-2.

[94] See appendix.

[95] *Agni*, 32.1-7, 166.9-15 ; cf. *Gautama Dharmasūtra*, 8.14-24.

[96] See appendix.

[97] *Purāṇic Records.*, p. 185.

Eight chapters (109-116) deal with holy places and their praises. They mention Puṣkara, Kurukṣetra, Vārāṇasī, Rājagṛha and other holy places. A separate chapter is devoted to the praise of the Gaṅgā, the Narmadā, Prayāga, and Vārāṇasī each. Gayā, however, receives a detailed treatment in three chapters.[98] The verses relating to these holy places, except Gayā, are appropriated from the *Mahābhārata* and the *Matsya Purāṇa*. The chapters on Gayā of our *Purāṇa* owe much to the *Vāyu Purāṇa*, which in its turn seems to have adopted the *Gayāmāhātmya* rather late. So these portions of the *Agni Purāṇa* are to be placed at least after the *Matsya*, whose relevant chapters on holy places are ascribed by Hazra to a period between c. A.D. 700-1250. But the upper limit of the period is somewhat higher. The chapters on holy places described in the *Agni Purāṇa* are assigned by Hazra to the ninth century A.D., which is reasonable.

The *Agni Purāṇa* claims to deal with the duties of the king (*rāja-dharma*), the military science (*dhanurveda*) and the *arthaśāstra*. These subjects are taken by our *Purāṇa* from the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, the *Matsya* and the *Nītisāra* of Kāmandaka, whereas the chapters on law and justice are borrowed from the law codes of Yājñavalkya and Nārada. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* quotes verses from the *Devala Smṛti*[99] and is itself quoted by the *Agni Purāṇa* ; so the date of at least these chapters of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* cannot be earlier than the ninth century ; these chapters may have been inserted in the *Agni Purāṇa* not earlier than the second half of the ninth century. The date of the *Matsya Purāṇa* seems to be intermediate between that of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Agni*. Kāmandaka, so far assigned to A.D. 400-600, has recently been ascribed to the eighth century by Devasthali.[100] Kane after a comparison of the text of *vyavahāra* section of the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* with that of the *Agni Purāṇa* opines that 'the text of Yājñavalkya preserved in the *Agni Purāṇa* is intermediate between the text of Viśvarūpa and that of the *Mitākṣarā*' and assigns these chapters of the *Agni Purāṇa* (253-258) to *circa* A.D. 900[101]. So ideas on polity contained in the *Agni Purāṇa* are not earlier than A.D. 400, and most probably were adopted in the second half of the ninth or the first half of the tenth century.

---

[98] *Agni*, chapts, 114-116.

[99] *VDP*, II. 73.203-204 are the same as the *Devala Smṛti* 45-46 ; cf. *Agni*, 170.30-31. Hazra, *Studies in the Upapurāṇas*, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1958, p. 200.

[100] *CA*, p. 300.

[101] *HDS*, Vol. I, p. 172.

The *Agni Purāṇa* devotes many chapters to the science of medicine and discusses the treatment of not only human beings but also of the elephant, the horse, the cow and even of trees. It describes the various types of snakes and suggests treatment of their bite as well as that of some injurious insects and animals. It further prescribes medicines against diseases caused by malevolent elements and planets. The chapters on the treatment of animals and trees are borrowed *verbatim* from the *Viṣṇudharmottara* though as progenitors of the science of the elephant and the horse respectively Pālakāpya and Śālihotra are introduced as interlocutors in our *Purāṇa*.

The subject of the treatment of human diseases is claimed to have been borrowed from two sources, the Suśruta and the Ātreya schools of medicine. The human anatomy, embryology and osteology are discussed separately in chapters 369-370. Suśruta represents surgery and Charaka medicine. Though our text claims to have borrowed Suśruta's ideas, we have little that can be regarded as surgery. It only states that a sore is to be opened with the help of a needle.[102] Compared to the advance made in surgery and surgical instruments by Suśruta, the exposition of the subject by the *Agni* is very scanty and suggests that chapters on medicine were incorporated in our text when surgery came to be looked down by the Buddhist physicians. However, some principles of medicines are borrowed by our *Purāṇa* from Suśruta. The classification of human diseases under four heads, physical (*śārīrika*), mental (*mānasika*), accidental (*āgantuka*) and natural (*sahaja*)[103] ; the grouping of six *rasas* under two, *saumya* and *āgneya* ; and the description of cold and hot medicaments (*śīta* and *uṣṇa vīrya*)[104] are adopted from Suśruta. Our *Purāṇa* accepts the view of Suśruta that a human body is made of sixteen *kaṇḍaras*,[105] sixteen *jālas*[106], six *kūrchas*[107], four *māṁsarajjus*[108], seven *sīvanyas*[109], nine hundred nerves (*snāyu*)[110], two hundred and ten joints (*saṁdhi*);[111] but it slightly differs from him in the enumeration of five hundred *peśīs*[112] and the *śirās* contained in a female body. Suśruta holds that a female body contains twenty *śirās* more than that of a man whereas our text puts it at twenty-four.[113] In the field of osteology the *Agni Purāṇa* follows the view of Charaka, and holds that the human body consists of three hundred and sixty bones[114] as against Suśruta who takes them to be only three hundred. In the field of medicine we do not find any mention of the symptoms of diseases, as is found in the *Mādhavanidāna* of *circa* A.D. 800, and so the chapters dealing with medicine were interpolated in our *Purāṇa* before Mādhava. Further, mercury is known to the compiler of our text but never recommended as medicine. Moreover, two chapters are borrowed *verbatim* from the *Viṣṇudharmottara.* Some verses of the chapter 285 on medicine are to be traced to the *Vṛnda-mādhava*, the *Chakradatta* and the *Vaṅgasena.* Chakrapāṇidatta and Vaṅgasena are themselves mere compilers. So chapters on medicine in our *Purāṇa* seem to belong to the period between Vṛnda and Chakrapāṇidatta or between the ninth and the tenth century.

---

[102] *Agni*, 279.55: *tathā sūchyupachārascha balikarma viśeṣataḥ.*

[103] *Ibid.*, 280.1 ; cf. *Suśruta.*, NSP, third ed. Bombay, 1938, *sūtrasthāna*, 1. 24-25.

[104] *Ibid.*, 281.1ff : cf. *Suśruta. sūtrasthāna*, 42.7ff.

[105] *Ibid.*, 370-22-23 ; cf. *Suśruta. śārīra.*, Banaras, 1950, 5.10.

[106] *Ibid.*, 370.23-24 ; cf. *Suśruta. śārīra.*, 5.11.

[107] *Ibid.*, 370.25 ; cf. *Suśruta. śārīra.*, 5.12.

[108] *Ibid.*, 370.26 ; cf. *Suśruta.*, *śārīra.*, 5.13.

[109] *Ibid.*, 370.27 ; cf. *Suśruta. śārīra.*, 5.14.

[110] *Ibid.*, 370.34.35 ; cf. *Suśruta. śārīra*, 5.34.

[111] *Ibid.*, 370.33-34 ; cf. *Suśruta. śārīra.*, 5.28.

The *Agni Purāṇa* contains eight chapters on metrics. They summarise the *Piṅgalasūtras* together with an unknown commentary to it. The gloss is challenged by Halāyudha in the second half of the tenth century without naming its author. Since our text is not aware of the popular commentary of Halāyudha to the *Piṅgala-sūtras*, it seems that its chapters on metrics were compiled before Halāyudha.[115]

The date of the chapters on poetics in the *Agni Purāṇa* has been widely discussed by Kane[116], De[117], Sankaran[118], Lahiri[119], Raghavan[120], Poddar[121], Verma[122] and others. Poddar thinks the chapters of the *Agni Purāṇa* to be one of the earliest on poetics, though post-Bharata. Sankaran, Lahiri and De take them to the pre-Bhoja period. De holds that the *Agni Purāṇa* is ignorant of the Dhvani school of Ānandavardhana ; and according to Lahiri, it was used as a source by Bhoja, although Raghavan refutes this view. Sankaran assigns the *Agni Purāṇa's* chapters on rhetoric to the second half of the ninth century or after Ānandavardhana.

---

[112] *Ibid.*, 370.36 ; cf. *Suśruta. śārīra.*, 5.45.

[113] *Ibid.*, 370.37-38 ; cf. *Suśruta. śārīra.*, 5.50.

[114] *Ibid.*, 370.27 ; cf. *Suśruta. śārīra.*, 5.17.

[115] Shastri, H. P., *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts,* Vol. V, preface, p. cl.

[116] *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, 1951, pp. 3-10 ; IA, XIVI, pp. 173ff.

[117] *History of Sanskrit Poetics,* Vol. I-II, second rev. ed. Calcutta, 1960, pp. 97-100.

[118] *Some Aspects of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit,* Madras, 1929, pp. 35-39.

[119] "The Theory of Rīti and Guṇa in the *Agni Purāṇa*," (*IHQ*, IX, pp. 448.-460).

[120] "Rīti and Guṇa in the *Agni Purāṇa*", (*IHQ*. X. pp. 776-779).

[121] *Sanskrit Sāhitya kā Itihāsa*, Bombay 1938, Vol. I, pp. 74-98.

[122] Verma, R. L., *Agni Purāṇa kā Kāvyaśāstrīya Bhāga*, Delhi, 1959, pp. 4-6.

Kane's view may be summarised as follows:—

Since, the *Agni Purāṇa* explains *bhāratī rīti* to have been propounded by Bharata, so it is post-Bharata, which is also approved by the identity between many verses in the *Agni Purāṇa* and those of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Further, the definitions of *rūpaka, utprekṣā, viśeṣokti, vibhāvanā, apahnuti* and *samādhi* given by the *Agni Purāṇa* are the same as those of the *Kāvyādarśa* of Daṇḍin, who seems to have been followed by the compiler of the *Agni Purāṇa*. Furthermore, the definitions of *rūpaka, ākṣepa, aprastutapraśaṁsā, samāsokti* and *paryāyokta* are almost similar to those in Bhāmaha, who is not earlier than the second half of the seventh century A.D. At the same time the *Agni Purāṇa* is aware of the idea of *dhvani* propounded in the *Dhvanyāloka* by Ānandavardhana, who flourished in the later half of the ninth century A.D. Besides, the *Agni Purāṇa* states the doctrine of *śṛṅgāra rasa* as *ānanda, ahaṁkāra* and *rasa*, and thus presents Bhoja's idea of *śṛṅgāra* as the only *rasa*. Finally, it enumerates four types of *rītis*, the functions of which closely follow the idea of Bhoja in his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*. On the basis of all this Kane concludes that the poetics section of the *Agni Purāṇa* was compiled about or little after A.D. 900 and probably after A.D. 1050.[123]

We may begin our own study of the date of the poetics of the *Agni Purāṇa* by comparing it with what we find in Bhoja, whose ideas are clearer and more consistent on the subject. The four *rītis* of the *Agni Purāṇa* are increased to six by Bhoja,[124] who according to De, develops some new ideas of the *Agni Purāṇa* in his *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*[125]. We may add that certain manuscripts of the *Yuktikalpataru*, a work by Bhoja, utilised by Īśvara Chandra Śāstrī show that the *Agni Purāṇa* was known to Bhoja, for he quotes its views to describe the good and bad qualities of a diamond.[126] So the *Agni Purāṇa* is earlier than Bhoja. However, the influence of Rājaśekhara on the *Agni Purāṇa* cannot be denied. We find that his *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* is probably the first text to divide the *alaṁkāras* into three categories, those of sound (*śabda*), those of sense (*artha*) and those of both (*śabdārtha*).[127] The *Agni Purāṇa* adopts this classification of the *alaṁkāras*[128] and most probably uses *śleṣa* when it states that one who knows the three types of *alaṁkāras* and their analysis, and can embellish speeches with them, is called an expert in *Śabdālaṁkāra* and the *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*.[129] The *Agni Purāṇa* speaks of four *pākas* of a poetic composition but actually names three, the *mṛdvīkāpāka*, the *nārikelapāka* and the *ambupāka*, and defines only the first.[130] Rājaśekhara speaks of nine *pākas* and classifies them into three categories, the worst, the middling and those which are to be accepted. The last group includes those which are enumerated by the *Agni Purāṇa*.[131] Perhaps the compiler of our *Purāṇa* does not mention those *pākas* which he thinks unfit for poetic composition. Similarly, the ideas of qualities (*guṇa*) of sound (*śabda*), sense (*artha*) and of both (*śabdārtha*) are derived by both the *Agni Purāṇa* and Bhoja from Rājaśekhara.[132]

---

[123] Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, pp. 3-10.

[124] De, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, rev. ed. Vol. II. p. 210.

[125] *Ibid.*, Vol. II. p. 210.

[126] *Yukti.*, p. 98.

Our *Purāṇa* counts *saṭṭaka* as a form of drama, first defined by Rājaśekhara, whose *Karpūramañjarī* is its earliest specimen. Sten Konow[133] holds that the definition of *saṭṭaka* given in the *Karpūramañjarī* suggests that it is not the first composition of its kind, but we agree with Chintaharan Chakravarty that this form of drama being not widely known it was necessary to define it in the prologue of the above mentioned work, although the practice is not found in any other drama.[134]

---

[127] *Agni*, 342.18.

[128] *Ibid.*, 342-18-19.

[129] *Ibid.*, 342.17-19.

[130] *Ibid.*, 346.22-23.

[131] *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*, chapter 5, pp. 48-51. The first group includes *pichumandapāka* (*nīma*). *vārtākapāka* (bringel) and *kramukapāka* (betel-nut). The second group consists of *badarapāka* (plum), *tintiḍīkapāka* (tamarind) and *trapuṣapāka* (cucumber). The good one includes *mṛdvīkāpāka* (grapes), *nārikelapāka* (coconut), and *sahakārapāka* (mango), Rājaśekhara favours the *nārikelapāka* while the *Agni Purāṇa the mṛdvīkāpāka*.

[132] Raghavan, "Some Aspects of Rīti and Guṇa in the *Agni Purāṇa*". (*IHQ*. X, p. 776).

[133] *Karpūramañjarī*, ed. Sten Konow with English translation and notes by C. R. Lanman, HOS, 1901. p. 195.

[134] *IHQ*, VIII, p. 170.

So in our opinion the *Agni Purāṇa* is later than Rājaśekhara (A. D. 880-920).

The *Agni Purāṇa* enumerates twenty-seven types of Sanskrit dramas[135] whereas Bharata, Dhanañjaya and the *Viṣṇudharmottara*[136] speak of only ten types of major dramas (*rūpakas*). It is probably the first text to catalogue so many types of drama, but it does not classify them into major and minor groups, *rūpaka* and *uparūpaka*, as is done later by Viśvanātha,[137] who provides us a list of twenty-eight varieties of drama. Though Dhanañjaya discusses the major kinds of drama, he does not refer to the difference between the *rūpaka* and *uparūpaka*. The time of this subdivision and the increase in types of drama to twenty-seven cannot be determined with certainty, but it cannot be earlier than Dhanañjaya (A.D. 974-996). Thus the chapters on dramaturgy and poetics of the *Agni Purāṇa* are later than Rājaśekhara and Dhanañjaya but earlier than Bhoja (A.D. 1018-1054).

The *Agni Purāṇa* has eleven chapters on the rules of grammar, which according to H. P. Shastri is an abstract of the Chāndra grammar.[138] This is evident because according to the *Agni Purāṇa* one who knows and studies the Chāndra grammar is a Chāndraka.[139] The date of Chandragomin, the founder of this school of grammar, is assigned to the first half of the sixth century by modern scholars including B. Liebach, who recovered it and edited the text as well as the gloss on it.[140] Shastri thinks that the chapters of the *Agni Purāṇa* on grammar belongs to the period prior to the reappearance of Pāṇinī school in the seventh century.[141] But a later date of these chapters is suggested by its reference to the *mlechchhas*,[142] and to the *bharata* in the generic sense of an actor.[143]

The lone chapter discussing vedic phonetics is rudimentary and, according to H. P. Shastri, an abstract of the *Nāradīyaśikṣā*.[144] Chapter

---

135 *Agni*, 338.1-4.

136 *Nāṭya*, KMS, 1943, 18.2-3 ; VDP. III. 17.18-29.

137 *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, with Hindi Tr. Satyavrata Singh, Varanasi, 1957, 6.3-6 ; Keith, *The Sanskrit Drama*, Oxford, 1924, p. 295.

138 *JBORS*, XIV, p. 332.

139 *Agni*, 356.8.

140 *HB*, Vol. I, p. 297 ; *Nāgarī Prachāriṇī Patrikā*, Vol. II. V. E. 2001, p. 307, etc.

142 *JBORS*, XIV, p. 332.

142 *Agni*, 350.13.

143 *Ibid.* 357.12.

144 *JBORS*, XIV, p. 332.

348 of our text, containing the monosyllabic dictionary, is borrowed from the *Ekākṣarākośa* of Kṣapaṇaka,[145] who according to a late saying, belonged to the court of Chandra Gupta II and was a contemporary of Varāhamihira. Though the date of Kṣapaṇaka remains unknown,[146] his monosyllabic dictionary is probably influenced by the monosyllabic tantric spells,[147] and may be assigned at least to the eighth century when Tantricism was more prominent.

H. P. Shastri assigns the chapters of the *Agni Purāṇa* on Yoga to the ninth century. He states that the *Agni Purāṇa* speaks of *Rāja-Yoga*, and not of the *Haṭha-Yoga*, which came into existence in the eighth century.[148] But he is ignorant of the fact that our text borrows at least three and half verses from the *Gorakṣapaddhati*, a famous work on *Haṭha-Yoga*, and following this work states that a human body consists of seventy-two thousand nerves and the navel is their centre, and the root (*kanda*) lies below it, wherefrom they shoot out to the different parts of the body.[149] Moreover, our *Purāṇa* speaks of the *kuṇḍalinī* and states that it is permeated with the essence of sun, moon and fire.[150] Shastri wrongly states that the *Agni Purāṇa* knows of only the lotus-seat (*padmāsana*) of the *Rāja-Yoga*. Chapter 373 of our *Purāṇa* starts with the injunction that the *yogī* should meditate upon the Supreme after sitting in postures like the lotus, etc., as discussed before.[151] It clearly shows that the compiler of our text knows also other types of seats used in the *Haṭha-Yoga*. Our view is supported by the fact that the compiler has borrowed many verses from the *Vāyavīyasaṁhitā* of the *Śiva Purāṇa*, which speaks of eight types of Yogic seats, *svastika*, *padma* (lotus), *ardhachandra* (crescent), *vīra* (brave), *yoga*, *prasādhita*, *paryaṅka* and one as liked by the *yogi* himself.[152] Moreover, it seems that originally the *Agni Purāṇa* contained a chapter dealing at least with the *Vīrāsana*,[153] borrowed from the *Viṣṇudharmottara*,[154] but in course of constant reshuffling of chapters it was lost in subsequent times. So the chapters

---

[145] *Anekārthadhvanimañjarī* with *Dvirūpakośa* and *Ekākṣarākośa*, Banaras, 1960.

[146] Keith, *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, Oxford, 1928, pp. 76 and 414.

[147] *Agni*, 348.14-28 portray the tantric influence.

[148] *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, Vol. V, preface, p. cli.

[149] *Agni*, 214.1-2.

[150] *Ibid.*, 102.25, 214.27.

[151] *Ibid.*, 373.1.

[152] *Uttarakhaṇḍa*, 37, 20.

[153] *Agni*, 171.4: *etatvīrāsanaṁ proktaṁ...*

[154] *VDP*, II, chapt. 123.

214 and 371-376 on Yoga know and describe the *Haṭha-Yoga* ; it also includes *yama* and *niyama* within the scope of Yoga which is not done by the *Gorakṣapaddhati*.[155] These chapters of the *Agni Purāṇa* are, therefore, later than the *Gorakṣapaddhati* and the *Vāyavīyasaṁhitā* of the *Śiva Purāṇa*. The date of the former is uncertain, but it cannot be earlier than the eighth century ; and, as for the latter, Hazra after a critical study assigns it to period between A. D. 800-1000.[156] Hence the chapters 214 and 371-376 of the *Agni Purāṇa* dealing with Yoga may be placed at least in the second half of the ninth and the first half of the tenth century. The emphasis on the *Haṭha-Yoga* by the *Agni Purāṇa* led to its rejection by Vallālasena, who thought it as a means of deception used by the Mīna-Ketanas or probably the followers of Mīnānātha,[157] who is identified with Matsyendranātha, the teacher of Gorakhanātha and one of the nine celebrated teachers of the Nātha sect.

We find that the *Agni Purāṇa* is included in almost all the lists of *Purāṇas*. It is mentioned by Alberuni[158] in A.D. 1030, and it appears that by the time of Vallālasena it had assumed such an encyclopaedic character that it was considered spurious by him. So our text is earlier than A.D. 1100.[159]

The analysis of the contents of the *Agni Purāṇa* shows that the text owes much to the various branches of literature of early medieval times and is especially indebted to the four *Vedas*, the aphorisms of *Upaniṣads*, all the important *Smṛtis* ; the *Viṣṇudharma*, the *Śivadharma*, the *Śiva*, the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Harivaṁśa Upapurāṇas* ; the *Viṣṇu*, the *Vāyu* and the *Matsya Purāṇas* ; the two epics, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* ; the *Viṣṇurahasya*, the *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra* and possibly to the other *Pañcharātra* works ; the *Gītā*, the *Sāṁkhyakārikā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, the *Charakasaṁhitā*, the *Suśrutasaṁhitā*, and the *Vṛndamādhava*. It also borrows from the *Nāradīyaśikṣā*, the monosyllabic lexicography of Kṣapaṇaka, the *Piṅgalasūtras* with an unknown commentary and the lexicon of Amarasiṁha. In the field of poetics, it draws upon Bharata, Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Vāmana, Udbhaṭa, Rudraṭa, Rudrabhaṭṭa,

---

[155] *Agni*, 102.21 ; *Pātañjalayoga*, 2.29-32 ; cf. *Gorakṣapaddhati*, 1.7 and *Śiva. Vāyavīya, Uttara.*, chapt, 37.

[156] 'The Problems relating to the *Śiva Purāṇa*', (*Our Heritage*, Vol. I. Pt. I, p. 63).

[157] Hazra, *Studies in the Upapurāṇas*, Vol. I, p. 236.

[158] *Alberuni's India*, Vol. I, pp. 130-131.

[159] Pargiter opines that the *Agni Purāṇa* was written sometime after the ninth century. (*AIHT*, p. 80).

Ānandavardhana, Kumārilabhaṭṭa, *Bhartṛmitra* and Rājaśekhara. It also knows all the *Purāṇas*, the *Purāṇasaṁhitā*[160] the *Brahma*, the *Rudra* and the *Śaktiyāmalas*,[161] the *Śivasaṁhitā*,[162] the *Śivaśāstra*,[163] and the Vaiṣṇava and the Śaiva *āgamas*.[164] The sources are so varied and the borrowing so eclectic that it is difficult to trace out all the sources.

H. P. Shastri[165] thinks that the *Agni Purāṇa* was compiled somewhere in Bengal or Bihar, far from Puṣkara, at a place difficult to reach. S. K. De[166] argues that the available manuscripts of the *Agni Purāṇa* are mainly in Bengali or Devanāgarī scripts and the Bengali manuscripts are the largest, and so in his opinion it indicates an eastern origin of the *Agni Purāṇa* or at least its popularity in this region. On the ground of its wide use, R. C. Hazra[167] opines that the *Agni Purāṇa* 'originated in Eastern Orissa or in the Western Bengal (most probably in the latter)'. A. M. T. Jackson[168] regards the *Agni Purāṇa* as a Gayā recension of the *Purāṇa*, and his view is endorsed by Rapson.[169] One may think that the *Agni Purāṇa* was redacted on the banks of Narmadā, for it states that a bath in the Gaṅgā gives salvation which is gained by only a look at the Narmadā.[170] But the verses describing Puṣkara as beyond one's reach and the exaltation of the Narmadā over the Gaṅgā are actually taken from the *Mahābhārata* and the *Matsya Purāṇa*,[171] and in no way represent the view of the compiler of our *Purāṇa*. Further, the chapters on consecration, initiation, architecture, spells, etc., declare the *deśika* brāhmaṇas (of *Madhyadeśa*) to be the best.[172] Of all the rivers the Gaṅgā occupies the greatest attention of our *Purāṇa*. A whole chapter is devoted to it, and besides being extolled everywhere it is declared to be capable of destroying all sins only if people remember it.[173] Gayā is pronounced to be the best of all the holy places,[174] it ranking second to the Gaṅgā in two lists of holy spots,[175] and heading three other similar lists.[176] For making gifts to brāhmaṇas our *Purāṇa* provides a ready-made formula, which is clearly intended for the people living by the side of the Gaṅgā or at Gayā or Prayāga.[177] Further, it gives three long chapters to the importance of Gayā and the procedure to be adopted for the *Gayāśrāddha*.[178] These chapters may be a compendium of similar material on Gayā in the *Vāyu Purāṇa*, but that does not in any way make Gayā less important in the *Agni Purāṇa*. So though the place of the first compilation of the *Agni Purāṇa* is doubtful, it appears that its final redaction took place somewhere in North-East India, very near to the Gaṅgā and the city of Gayā, which had attained prominence under the Pālas.

---

[160] *Agni*, 150.31.
[161] *Ibid.*, 145.1, 326.7.
[162] *Ibid.*, 72.26.
[163] *Ibid.*, 102.4.
[164] *Ibid.*, 383.53 and 55.
[165] *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, Vol. V, preface, pp. cxlvi-II.
[166] *Bhand, Comm. Volume*, p. 74; HB, Vol. I, p. 296n.
[167] 'Studies in the genuine *Āgneya Purāṇa* alias *Vahni Purāṇa*. (*Our Heritage*, Vol. I, Pt. I, p. 232-233).
[168] Centenary Volume of *JBBRAS*, p. 73.
[169] *CHI*, 1922, p. 268.
[170] *Agni*, 113.1.
[171] *Ibid.*, 109.8 113.1; The same verse is quoted from *Mbh.* by the *Tīrthaprakāśa*, p. 483; cf. *Matsya*, 185.11.
[172] *Ibid.*, 27.12, 45, 69, 79; 35.3; 58.9, etc.

---

[173] *Ibid.*, 121.66, 174.18, 209.57, 383.57, 120.30: *rato gaṅgāprabhavati smaraṇātpāpanāśini.*

[174] *Ibid.*, 114.1, 114.32.

[175] *Ibid.*, 174.18, 209.57.

[176] *Ibid.*, 85.8, 117.65, 383.57.

[177] *Ibid.*, 209.57.

[178] *Ibid.*, chapts. 114-116.

CHAPTER III

STATE AND KINGSHIP

Several *Purāṇas* discuss the origin of the state and define it, but the *Agni Purāṇa* does not. Nevertheless, it accepts the view that the state comprises seven limbs or *prakṛtis* and repeats it at three different places.[1] The *Arthaśāstra* is the earliest available text to state the *saptāṅga* theory of state, which seems to have been accepted by both the *arthaśāstra*[2] and the *smṛti*[3] schools of Hindu political thought. However, some texts increase the number of the elements of the state in later times. The *Śāntiparva* of the *Mahābhārata*[4] states that the state possesses eight limbs but does not specify the eighth. In the list of seven constituents the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*[5] supplants *svāmī* and *amātya* by *sāma* and *dāna*. Some manuscripts of the *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi*[6] enumerate nine elements of the state and add *pauras* and *śreṇis* to the seven limbs. So our period shows a tendency to include peace, gifts, citizens and guilds as the elements of the state. The emphasis on gifts by the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* betrays a brāhmaṇical bias while the inclusion of town people and the mercantile community among the components of the state by Someśvaradeva may indicate the extensive trade and commerce carried on in the Chaulukya country.[7] Anyhow, our *Purāṇa* does not in any way modify the traditional enumeration of the seven constituents of the state.

As regards the relative importance of the seven limbs we should examine the order of their mention, made at five different places in our *Purāṇa*.[8] An analysis of the passages shows that the king (*svāmī*) and his administrative officers (*amātya*) head the list everywhere. They are followed by the territory and the people (*janapada* or *rāṣṭra)* and the

---

1 *Agni,* 225.11, 233.12, and 239.1.
2 *Arth.,* 6.1 ; *KNS,* 4.1 and 8.5.
3 *Manu,* 9.294 ; *Yāj.,* 1.353.
4 *Śānti.,* 122.8.
5 II. 145.3.
6 p. 3n: *svāmyamātyasuhṛītkośarāṣṭradurgabalānī cha,*
rājyāṅgāni prakṛtayaḥ paurānāṁ śreṇayopi cha.
7 Mazumdar, A. K., *Chaulukyas of Gujarat,* Bombay. 1956, pp. 265-288.
8 (i) 225.11 ; (ii) 233.12 ; (iii) 239.1 ; (iv) and (v) in the verses describing good and bad qualities of these elements in chapts. 239 and 241.

fort in four lists. Then come treasury (*koṣa*) and force (*daṇḍa*), and the last position is occupied by allies (*mitra*). The *Agni Purāṇa*[9] quotes the view of Kāmandaka that treasury is the root of the king. However, at another place, it quotes from the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* which makes the king the basis of the whole state apparatus,[10] but it, significantly, adds that the state (*rājya*) should be especially protected.[11] So sources earlier than the *Agni Purāṇa* consider the king to be the chief of the elements of the state, his power resting on his treasury.

The notable contribution of our *Purāṇa* is the exaltation of the kingdom (*rāṣṭra*) over all the other elements of the state. This is apparent from the additions made by it to the verses quoted from the *Kāmandaka Nītisāra* and the *Viṣṇudharmottara.* It makes the kingdom (*rājya*) next in importance to the king at one place[12] and chief of all the seven constituents of the state at another. It enjoins the king that he should always nurse his kingdom.[13] Probably the compiler of our *Purāṇa* is inspired in some measure by Kāmandaka, who opines that all the limbs of the state depend on kingdom (*rāṣṭra*) which should be protected at all cost[14]. Somadeva Sūri also attaches great importance to it. In the very beginning of the *Nītivākyāmṛta* he pays homage to *rājya* as the root of all the four ideals of Hindu life.[15] So in our period we find a shift of emphasis from king to his kingdom or the state itself. This revolutionary view may not have been palatable to those who still believed in the traditional theory of the supremacy of the king. Though the date and the place of compilation of the manuscript utilized by M. N. Dutt for translation is uncertain, it says that 'the monarchical office is the most important of all the seven factors constituting a kingdom, and the means which secures a good government to the people, (and hence) should be always kept in mind by a king.'[16] Thus this particular manuscript does not lay stress on the value of the kingdom. Its copyist may have been influenced by the traditional view of the king's importance. Anyhow, all the other published manuscripts of the *Agni Purāṇa* contain the verse exalting the kingdom, as we find in the text which we have made our basis for study.

---

[9] 241.22: *koṣamūlo hi bhūpatiḥ ; KNS,* 13.33: *koṣamūlo hi rājeti ; cf. VDP,* II. 61.17 : *kośaṁ rājyatarormūlaṁ.*

[10] 225.12 ; cf. *VDP,* II. 65.21-22.

[11] 225.12: *tasmādrājyaṁ viśeṣataḥ.*

[12] 225.12 ; cf. *VDP,* II. 65.22.

[13] 239.2: *rājyāṅgānāṁ varaṃ rāṣṭraṃ sādhanaṁ pālayetsadā ;* cf. *KNS,* 4.1-2.

[14] *KNS,* 6.3.

[15] *NVA,* p. 7: *atho dharmārtha kāmaphalāya rājyāya namaḥ.*

[16] Dutt. M. N., *Eng,* Tr. Vol. II, p. 853.

Since kingdom is considered to be the most important element of the state by the *Agni Purāṇa* we propose to examine the *rāṣṭra* or *janapada* first. Our *Purāṇa* elaborates the good qualities of the kingdom (*janapada*) on the pattern of Kāmandaka and states that it should abound in food, mines, minerals and pastures, and be well-watered. It should possess holy places, beautiful sceneries, elephant force (forest?) and should not be dependent on god for rain. It is to be mainly populated by śūdras, artisans, merchants, and industrious peasants. The people of the kingdom should be devoted to their own king and hostile to the enemies, capable of enduring hardships and be wide-spread (*pṛthuḥ*), pious, and rich in cattle wealth. The *Agni Purāṇa*[17] adds that the kingdom should be inhabited by foreigners from various countries and be ruled by a king who is neither fool nor addicted to passions. At another place it describes the weaknesses of the kingdom (*rāṣṭra vyasana*), which is not so elaborate as in Kāmandaka,[18] and states that it should be free from dearth of rain, troubles, etc.[19]

We find that the *rāṣṭra* or *janapada* of the *Agni Purāṇa* lays emphasis not only on cattle and pasture together with fertility of soil and things such as rain, irrigation facilities, etc., necessary for agricultural and pastoral economy but also on the improvement of water and land communications, which are essential for trade and commerce. Mines, minerals, artisans, merchants, and markets (*paṇya*[20]) are also included in the list of the good qualities of the *janapada*, which shows the commercial and industrial nature of the state. So it will not be fair on our part to accept the rendering of *rāṣṭra* as 'rural area' suggested by U. N. Ghosal.[21]

Further, we find that our *Purāṇa* does not presuppose an isolated state having no relations with other states. Contrary to this, it expects the kingdom to be inhabited by persons from different states within India.

[17] 239.24-27.

[18] cf. *KNS*, 13.63-64.

[19] *Agni*, 241.27.

[20] The *Agni Purāṇa* reads '*puṇya*' instead of '*paṇya*' in *KNS*, 4.51, which is the correct form.

[21] *A History of Indian Political Ideas*, Oxford, 1959, p. 445.

We may attribute the importance attached to the *rāṣṭra* or *rājya* by the *Agni Purāṇa* to the unstable political condition of India during our period when so many kingdoms rose and fought among themselves. Such a condition threw a challenge to political thinkers. So the compiler of our *Purāṇa* declares the *rāṣṭra* to be the best of all the seven limbs of the state and asks the king to protect it. It goes even to prescribe charms, auspicious moments, and hymns to gods and goddesses, to win the battle[22] and achieve stability of the kingdom.[23] So protection and stability of the kingdom seem to be the prime responsibility of the king. As a corollary the king is enjoined by the *Agni Purāṇa*[24] to protect and nurse the state. According to it the king who oppresses the kingdom remains in hell for long[25] and is even destroyed.[26]

Our *Purāṇa* wants these seven elements to be mutually helpful and interdependent[27] like an organic whole, as Kāmandaka does. The *Matsya Purāṇa*[28] asks the king to imprison those who revolt against any of these constituents of the state but advises him neither to be liberal nor ruthless towards them. If he is liberal he would be surrounded and governed by the people, if he is ruthless the people would be against him. According to the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*[29] the king shall banish those who place obstacles in the normal functioning of any element and kill those who are dangerous to, or revolt against, any of these constituents of the state. In all such cases our text prescribes death and annihilation,[30] which is far more severe than the punishment ordained by the earlier *Purāṇas*.

It seems that the real problem of the period was to protect the kingdom against neighbouring states and to extend it at their cost. This would have required enormous expenditure as well as personal ability and leadership on the part of the king. So our *Purāṇa*[31] repeats the principle laid down by Kauṭilya and Kāmandaka that the king is the root of the state, and treasury the root of the king. It prescribes incantations, spells and charms, and amulets to win battle as also to bring stability to the state.

---

[22] *Agni*, chapts. 123-136.

[23] *Ibid.*, 237.18-19: *susthiratvaṁ cha rājyasya saṁgrāma vijayādikaṃ,*
śrīstotraṁ satataṃ tasmātpaṭhechch śṛṇuyānnaraḥ.

[24] *Ibid.*, 225.12,

[25] *Ibid.*, 223.7.

[26] *Ibid.*, 225.31 ; *VDP*, II. 65.70.

[27] *Ibid..* 239.1 ; *KNS*, 4.1-2.

[28] *Matsya*, 219.21-23 ; cf. *VDP*, II. 65.23-24.

[29] II. 145.4.

[30] *Agni*, 225.12, 233.13.

[31] *Ibid.*, 237.19.

KINGSHIP

The *Agni Purāṇa* follows the traditional pattern in placing the *svāmī* or the lord at the top of the seven limbs of the state in all its five lists.[32] Literally the term *svāmī* indicates a sense of possession over the territory, gained through conquests or otherwise. At one place our text quotes verses from the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* to support the *arthaśāstra* view, according to which the king or the *svāmī* forms the root of the state and its seven components.[33] But since our text elevates the kingdom (*rāṣṭra*) to the highest position among the seven limbs of the state at another place,[34] it seems to suggest some decline in the position of the king.

Our text does not refer to any theory of the origin of kingship but throws some light on the nature of this institution. The earlier brāhmaṇical texts such as the *Manu Smṛti*,[35] the *Matsya Purāṇa*,[36] and the *Śāntiparva*[37] speculate on the divine origin of kingship. *Manu*[38] enjoins the people not to despise even an infant king as he is a great god in human form. The same verse is quoted by other late works such as the *Nītiprakāśikā*, the *Rājanītiprakāśa*, the *Kṛtyakalpataru Rājadharmakāṇḍa*, etc., sometimes with acknowledgment and sometimes without it.[39] The king is thus identified with god in our period. The *Agni Purāṇa*[40] prescribes similar incantations for the consecration of a god or a king. It recalls the old story of Pṛthu,[41] who became the first consecrated monarch on the earth after being annointed by Hari and Brahmā.[42]

---

[32] *Supra*, p. 27.

[33] *Agni*, 225.12 ; *VDP*, II. 65.21-25 ; *Arth.*, 6.1 and 8.1; *NVA*, 17.3: *svāmīmūlāḥ sarvāḥ prakṛtayo ; Matsya*, 218.34.

[34] *Ibid.*, 239.2.

[35] 7.3. *rājānamasṛjat prabhuḥ.*

[36] *Matsya*, 225.1.

[37] Chapts. 67-68 ; *Arth.*, 1.13.

[38] 7.8.

[39] *NP*, 8.5 ; *Rājanītiprakāśa*, p. 17 ; *Rājadharmakāṇḍa*, p. 5.

[40] 219.1.

[41] *Ibid.*, 1815: *rājasūyabhiṣiktānāmādyaḥ sa pṛthivīpatiḥ.* cf. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (V. 3.5.4) ; *Viṣṇu* P., I.13.1.ff.

[42] *Ibid.*, 19.22 ; *etatsarvaṁ harirbrahmā abhiṣichya pṛhtuṃ nṛpaṃ,*

According to *Nārada*[43] and *Manu*[44] the king represents five and eight deities respectively, but according to the *Agni Purāṇa* the king assumes functions of nine deities. It is stated that the king acts as Bhāskara (sun) because it is difficult to gaze at him, and he acts as moon for his presence gladdens the people. He sweeps the world with spies, punishes the evildoers and burns them, and so is compared to Samīra (wind), Manu Vaivaśvata and Pāvaka (fire) respectively. Like Kubera (god of wealth) and Varuṇa (god of water) he makes gifts to the brāhmaṇas and showers wealth on the people. He sustains the people like Pṛthivī (earth), and finally as Hari protects his subjects through the three types of energies.[45] Our *Purāṇa*[46] describes the kings of the Yadu dynasty and informs us that King Devavṛdha was best among men and equal to god. In another chapter dealing with twelve great battles of the past, our *Purāṇa* lays down that the king, the princes, sages, and gods are Hari incarnate, whether their names are mentioned in the list of incarnations or not.[47] The present list of gods, with whom the king is equated, is the same as in Manu and the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, but Hari is certainly a new god with whom the king is identified. This shows that the *Agni Purāṇa* is influenced in this respect by vaiṣṇavite ideas. The idea of divinity of the king is developed further, for even the associates and equipment of the king such as elephant, horse, sword, etc., are attributed to divinity or linked up with some divine origin.[48]

Though the idea that the king's body is composed of the particles of various gods such as Indra, Agni, Yama, etc., is as old as Manu,[49] in our period the king is considered to be identical with god and an incarnation of some god, particularly Viṣṇu. The *Bṛhaddharma Purāṇa*[50] states that the king is Indra, he rules with Viṣṇu's lustre, and is the quintessence of all gods. A similar idea is repeated in the *Viṣṇudharmottara*.[51] The *Mudrārākṣasa*[52] declares the king as an image of god Viṣṇu, whereas its commentator Ḍhuṇḍirāja[58] quotes an anonymous *smṛti* text that the king is a human incarnation of Viṣṇu. It is surprising that even contemporary Jain writers compare him with brāhmaṇical gods, which shows the popularity of this ideal. Somadeva Sūri[54] identifies the king with the brāhmaṇical trinity, Brahmā, Nārāyaṇa (Viṣṇu) and Pinākapāṇi (Śiva), and states that there is no other visible god than the king himself[55] who is a superior god.[56] The Jain monk Hemachandra[57] states that Mūlarāja, the founder of the Chaulukya dynasty of Aṇahilavāḍa, was Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva. The Gwalior Inscription of Mihir Bhoja states that the primeval Nārāyaṇa is born twice, as Nāgabhaṭa I and again as Nāgabhaṭa II. The poet Bālāditya of the inscription praises Bhoja lavishly and describes him as the image of Nārāyaṇa.[58] Bhoja had assumed the epithet of *ādivarāha*, an incarnation of Viṣṇu. We have coins of this king with the legend *śrīmadādivarāha*.[59] The *Skanda Purāṇa*[60] also depicts Bhoja as such. A little later the Timana Grant of Mehra Jagamalla (V. E. 1264-A. D. 1206) calls the Chaulukya king Bhīmadeva the *laṅkeśvara nārāyaṇāvatāra* and the Royal Asiatic Society's (London) Grant (V. E. 1266—A.D. 1209) calls him *abhinava siddharājadeva-vola* (*bāla*) *nārāyaṇāvatāra*.[61]

---

[43] Ed. Jolly, 17. 26; cf. *Raghuvaṁśa*, 4.12.

[44] 7.7 and 9.303.

[45] *Agni*. 226.17-20 ; cf. *Matsya* 225. 8-11 ; *Manu*, 9.303-6 ; *VDP*, II, 2.9, II. 71.1 ; *Bṛhaddharma*, III. 3,6-9 ; *Mārkaṇḍeya*, 27.21-26.

[46] 275.26.

[47] *Ibid.*, 276.25: *rājāno rājaputrāścha munayo devatā hariḥ,*
yaduktaṁ yachcha naivoktamavatārā harerime.

[48] *Ibid.*, 269.14, 269.4 and 288.17, 269.28-29, 269.12.

[49] *Manu*, 7.3-4.

[50] III. 3.6-9.

[51] II. 2.9, II. 71.11-12.

[52] VII. 19.

However, the divinity of the king is vigorously criticised by Bāṇa.[62] Though a brāhmaṇa, he calls it an invention of unscrupulous flatterers of the king. The minister Śukanāsa informs the prince Chandrāpīḍa that the king is made by the flatterers to consider himself to be four-armed Viṣṇu and three-eyed Śiva, and in trying to act like them he becomes an object of public ridicule. The contemporary commentator Medhātithi calls it only verbiage (*arthavāda*) to say that the creator

---

[53] On above.

[54] *NVA*, 29.17-19: ... *kṣatraputro bhavati brahmā...rājānaṁ nārāyaṇamāhaḥ.. bhūpatirbhavati pinākapāṇiḥ.*

[55] *Ibid.*, 29.16: *tripuruṣamūrtitvānna bhūbhujaḥ pratyakṣaṁ daivamasti.*

[56] *Ibid.*, 5.67: *rāja hi paramaṁ daivataṃ....*

[57] Quoted from his *Siddha-Hema in Glory that was Gūrjara Deśa*, Vol.I, p. 217: *haririva balibandhakarastriśaktiyuktaḥ pinākapāṇiriva. kamalāśrayaścha vidhiriva jayati śrīmūlarājanṛpaḥ.*

[58] *EI.*, XVIII. 107-114, vv. 4, 8 and 19; *Gūrjara Deśa.*, Vol. I, pp. 121-122.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 123.

[60] *Prabhāsakhaṇḍa, Vastrāpathamāhātmya*, 6.20: *kānyakubje mahākṣetre rājā bhojeti viṣṇutaḥ.*

[61] *DHNI*, Vol. II, pp. 1007-1009.

[62] *Kādambarī, Pūrvabhāga*, para. 107, pp. 234-235,

produced a king out of divine elements. He adds that the king as such possesses no divinity. The dislike for the divinity of the king on the part of Bāṇa may reasonably be ascribed to the fact that Pulakeśin, the greatest enemy of his patron Harṣa, had assumed the epithet *parameśvara*.[63] If we are to give more credence to the records of the successor of Pulakeśin than his own record, it would appear the latter assumed the title of *parameśvara* by defeating *Harṣavardhana*.

We may conclude that the king's claim of being made of the divine elements and his assumption of epithets, *parameśvara*, *paramadaivata* and *dharaṇivarāha* indicating superhuman qualities, which began actually with Samudra-gupta,[64] culminated in his transformation into a god incarnate. But epithets did not always imply increasing power. They became so conventional later that even a weak king assumed them. We have the example of Narasiṁha-gupta, who though weak, had assumed the title of rising sun (*bālāditya*).[65] The contrast between weak kings and high-sounding divine titles may have led Medhātithi to scorn the idea of king's divinity.

The *Agni Purāṇa* cites verses from the *Amarakośa* to give different synonyms of the king. They are *mūrdhābhiṣikta*, *rājanya*, *bāhuja*, *kṣatriya*, *virāṭ*, *rājā*, *aśeṣasāmanta*, *adhīśvara*, *chakravartī*, *sārvabhauma*, and *nṛpa*.[66] Besides being called *samrāṭ*, *bhūpa*, *pṛthivīpati*,[67] *svāmī*,[68] *adhipati*,[69] *narendra*,[70] *nṛpati*[71] and *mahārāja*,[72] he is also addressed as *bhaṭṭāraka* and *deva*.[73] Our *Purāṇa* states that by performing rituals one becomes *rājarājeśvara*[74] and *maṇḍalādhipati*.[75] The terms used by our text for the king are not explained in terms of grades or powers, as is done in the *Mahābhārata*, the *Nāradanīti* and the *Rājanītikāmadhenu*[76] as quoted in the *Rājanītiratnākara*. The *Mahābhārata* mentions two grades *samrāṭ* and *adhīśvara*; Nārada mentions three grades, *samrāṭ* or *chakravarti*, *sakara*-paying monthly or annual taxes. and *akara*-sending taxes as gifts according to convenience. The *Rājanītikāmadhenu* classifies even the *sakara* and the *akara* kings into two. The two classes of *akara* kings are those who do not pay taxes on account of their power and those who do not pay taxes on account of the favour shown to them by the emperor.[77] Similarly *sakara* kings are said to be of two grades, those with judicial power and those without it. This classification tends to show the rise of feudal lords in medieval India. Our text does not attempt the gradation of the kings, but the titles *rājarājeśvara*, *adhīśvara*, *maṇḍaleśvara*, etc. support this general tendency.

---

[63] *CA*, pp. 109 and 115.
[64] *Ibid.*, pp. 342-343.
[65] *Ibid.*, p. 34.
[66] *Agni*, 366.1-2.
[67] *Ibid.*, 18.15, 239.26.
[68] *Ibid.*, 225.12, etc.
[69] *Ibid.*, 97.74.
[70] *Ibid.*, 130.14.
[71] *Ibid.*, 253.66.
[72] *Ibid.*, 66.9.
[73] *Ibid.*, 360.76.
[74] *Ibid.*, 211.27.
[75] *Ibid.*, 211.66.
[76] *RR*, pp. 3-5.

These appellations given to the king by our *Purāṇa* throw some important light. Some of these titles are simple and traditional such as *nṛpa*, *rājā*, *rājanya*, *svāmī*, *pṛthivīpati*, *bhūpa*, etc. On the other hand, titles such as *deva* and *bhaṭṭāraka* definitely date back to the Gupta period. The king and the queen began to be called *deva* and *devī* when they were identified with god, which is certainly a late practice. The terms 'lord of the king of kings' (*rājarājeśvara*) and 'lord of the king' (*adhīśvara*) apparently introduce feudal grades in our period.

We get some idea of the caste to which the king should generally belong. Besides being called kṣatriya, the king is given the title *bāhuja*, which means 'one born from the arms (of Brahmā)' i. e. the kṣatriya. Our *Purāṇa* uses the terms *nṛpa* and *rājā* in the sense of kṣatriya, as can be inferred from the age of the sacred thread ceremony prescribed for the *nṛpa* caste.[78] Similarly when our text enjoins seats made of different materials for the three higher castes during a Vedic sacrifice, it uses the term *rājā* to mean the kṣatriya caste.[79] It is clear that the king is identified with the kṣatriya caste and *vice-versa*. So our *Purāṇa* seems to accept the old tradition which prefers kṣatriya for the post of the king. At the same time it does not debar members of other castes from being kings. Even in the chapter dealing with rules of general conduct, the *Agni Purāṇa* significantly leaves out Manu's verse, advising the people not to reside in a country ruled by a śūdra king.[80] Manu's commentator Medhātithi, who belongs to our time, does not always take

---

[77] We notice a most detailed differentiation of kings though based on their annual income in the *Śukranīti* (1. 184-187).

[78] *Agni*, 153.6.

[79] *Ibid.*, 259.56.

[80] *Ibid.*, 155.24 ; cf. *VDP*, II. 89.45.48: *strināyake bālapatau śūdrarājye tathaiva cha* ; *Manu*, 4.1: *na śūdrarājye nivasennādhārmikajanavṛte*,

rājā to mean a kṣatriya.[81] There are other contemporary commentators. who like to call a person of any caste *rājā*, provided he is a *de facto* king.[82] So we find two tendencies in our period: one is to reserve kingship for the kṣatriyas alone and the other to recognise the ruling king as a kṣatriya. In the *Agni Purāṇa* the first is strong and the second weak.

Qualifications of the King:

Since the king was the pivot of the state machinery in early India, nearly all the texts on polity discuss the qualifications of the king. Some[83] devote an independent chapter called (*rājaguṇāḥ*) to it. Our *Purāṇa* provides us with four different, consolidated lists of such qualifications and also makes stray references to them. At first it describes the weaknesses and temptations to which the king is prone to fall a prey. They are usually termed six-fold inner enemies (*ariṣaḍvarga*) by ancient texts. The king is asked to subdue licentious propensities, anger, greed, pride, arrogance, and boastfulness (*darpa*) before embarking on a plan to win the allegiance of his own officers and the people and to undertake the conquest of his external enemies.[84] Control of these passions brings happiness to the king.[85] Besides them, the king is advised to refrain from other weaknesses (*vysana*) such as addiction to hunting, gambling, wine and women. Furthermore, he is to give up day-sleep, roaming without purpose (*vṛthāṭyam*), harsh and abusive language as well as frivolous expenditure. The king should forsake them as they lead to the destruction of the state and its affairs.[86] Moreover, our texts stresses that for the protection of the people the king should be free from these personal weaknesses as far as possible.[87] The king is asked not to cut jokes with his servants. Though advisable in acts of anger, pride, arrogance, quarrel, use of harsh language and sins, procrastination definitely spoils the work;[88] so he is advised to

[81] *Manu*, 7.1: *rājaśabdastu neha kṣatriyajātivachanaḥ kiṁ tarhi abhiṣekādiguṇayogini puruṣaṁ vartate.*

[82] *RR*, pp. 2-3; *Aparārka* quoted by the *Rājanītiprakāśa*, p.15.

[83] *VDP*, II. 3; *Rājadharmakāṇḍa*, chapt. 3; *Rājanītiprakāśa*, pp. 115-121.

[84] *Agni*, 225.8; *VDP*, II. 65.15-17; *Matsya*, 219. 14-16; *Kathāsaritasāgara*, VI. 8. 191-192.

[85] *Ibid.*, 238.7.

[86] *Ibid.*, 225. 4.7, 241. 25-26.

[87] *Ibid.*, 225.14: *lokasaṁgrahaṇārthāya kṛtakavyasano bhavet.*
M. N. Dutt wrongly translates the verse to mean arrangements for hunting excursions, drinking bouts, etc. by the king for people's amusement. (*vide* Eng. Tr. Vol. II. p. 805).

[88] *Ibid.*, 225.15-16.

always guard against it. Our text states that humility not only destroys the king but also helps him to acquire kingdom.[89] This implies that humility has to be practised with caution and extremes have to be avoided. Following Manu, the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Matsya Purāṇa*, our text instructs the king to imbibe the good qualities of even lower orders, animals and birds. Such animals and their qualities number four according to Manu;[90] the late *Purāṇas*[91] make them more than double. Accordingly the king should possess the deep insight of an heron (*vaka*) in financial matters, prowess of a lion, swiftness of a wolf, crookedness of an hare, firmness of a boar in attack, gorgeous demeanour of a peacock, sweet tongue of a cuckoo (and parrot according to the *Viṣṇudharmottara*), faithfulness of a horse (blind?—according to the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, Bombay Edn.), and above all the suspicious nature of a crow.

Based on the *Arthaśāstra* and Kāmandaka, our *Purāṇa*[92] presents two exhaustive lists of the positive royal qualities, which are not as many as in the *Saṅkhalikhita*[93] and the *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi*[94] but slightly more than in the *Yājñavalkya* and the *Kātyāyana Smṛtis.* They number forty-five in the *Saṅkhalikhita,* forty-four in the *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi,* nineteen in the *Yājñavalkya* and twenty in the *Kātyāyana Smṛti.* Someśvaradeva states that the forty-four qualities required in a king are necessary for gaining kingdom and maintaining its stability.[95] Of them five qualities are declared by him to be the most essential for the king: honesty, bravery, forgiveness, charity, and the wisdom to know the talents of others.[96]

Our text declares that humility, root of all political framework, leads to the control of senses and thus helps the king to protect his kingdom.[97] The king is to achieve it through a study of scriptures. Passions are compared with mad elephants roaming wantonly in the forest, and are to be controlled through the goad of knowledge. Thus the king is required to acquire the knowledge of the self (*ānvīkṣikī*), the Vedic literature (*trayī*), economics (*vārtā*), and polity (*daṇḍanīti*).[98] These four disciplines are covered by the term '*rājavidyā*' used by Somadeva Sūri,[99] meaning thereby that they are meant for the king. Our *Purāṇa* enumerates nineteen qualities which increase the prosperity of the king. They are listed as knowledge of the different branches of learning, wisdom, courage, skilfulness, confidence, retentive memory, enthusiasm, good speech, oration, generosity, patience during bad hours, influence, purity, friendship, self-sacrifice, honesty, gratefulness, knowledge of the Vedas (*śruti*), character, and control of senses.[100] Besides, the king is asked to follow some general rules of conduct (*sāmānya dharma*) necessary for all castes and stages of life such as non-violence, truthfulness, honesty, purity, kindness and forbearance.[101] Our *Purāṇa* also dilates upon the qualities of a good person and his behaviour towards others, presumably to be emulated by the king.[102] It seems that the king is to set an example for his subjects. Contemporary writers make the point more clear. Somadeva Sūri[103] states that if the king is not virtuous, others will not be. Murārimiśra[104] (8th-9th century A.D,) holds that the character of the people follows that of the king.

---

[89] *Ibid.,* 225.21: *naśyedavinayādrājā rājyaṁ cha vinayāllabhet.*

[90] *Manu,* 7.106.

[91] *Matsya,* 214. 69-71 ; *VDP,* II. 65. 61-64, it replaces *andha* for *aśva* and adds parrot (*śuka*) before cuckoo (*kokila*), but verses quoted from it by Mitramiśra (*Rājanītiprakāśa,* p. 125) are similar to verses found in the other two *Purāṇas.*

[92] *Agni,* 238.4-5 ; 239.2-5 ; cf. *Arth.,* 6.1 ; *KNS,* 1.20-22 and 4.6-8.

[93] *Rājadharmakāṇḍa,* chapt. 3, *Nītimayūkha,* pp. 47-48 ; *Rājanītiprakāśa,* pp. 116-121 ; for *Sankhalikhita* and other *Smṛti* texts, consult the *Rājadharmakāṇḍa.*

[94] I, 2.2-7.

[95] *Ibid.,* I. 2.1.

[96] *Ibid.,* I. 2.8. This is slightly more than the three great qualities mentioned by Kāmandaka, who declares them potent enough to invest the king with other qualities.

Again, when our *Purāṇa* deals with the good qualities of the seven limbs of the state it states that the king should possess twenty-one attributes. These are character, age, ability, charity, quickness, non-interference in others' work (*avisaṁvāditā*), honesty, respect for aged, gratefulness, divine favour, prudence, large family, capacity to keep the feudatories under control (*śakyasāmantatā*), steadfastness, foresight and enthusiasm. Further, the king is required to be pure of character, humble, virtuous and a man of broad outlook (*sthūḷaḷakṣitā*).[105]

---

[97] *Agni*, 238.2 ; 225.22.

[98] *Ibid.*, 238.6 and 8.9.

[99] *NVA*, 5.55: *ānvīkṣikī trayī vārtā daṇḍanītiriti chatasrorājavidyāḥ.*

[100] *Agni*, 238.4-5 ; cf. *KNS*, 1.21-22.

[101] *Ibid.*, 238.10.

[102] *Ibid.*, 238.11-22.

[103] *NVA*, 17.33-34 : *adharmapare rājñi ko nāma nādharmaparaḥ, rājñāvajñāto yaḥ sa sarvairavajñāyate.*

[104] *Anargharāghava*, Act 6, p. 370: *yachchhīlaḥ svāmī tachchhīlāstasya prakṛtayaḥ.*

[105] Cf. *EI*, VIII, p. 44.

Although our text quotes verses relating to the king from Kāmandaka, knowingly or by mistake it ascribes some attributes given herein to the minister. This may denote an increasing importance of the ministers during the period under review. Moreover, our text does not classify the qualities, as is done by Kauṭilya[106] and Kāmandaka,[107] under four heads, namely noble birth (*abhigāmika*), personal attributes (*ātmasampat*), intellect (*dhīguṇāḥ*), and enthusiasm (*utsāha*). It mentions only the first two and transfers the remaining two to the ministers.

An analysis of the qualifications for kingship brings out some important points. Though good lineage is necessary, there is no insistence on caste qualification. The *smṛti* tradition does not favour a non-kṣatriya king, and is accepted even by some late commentators[108] such as Nīlakaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa and Mitramiśra. On the other hand, in view of so many kings belonging to non-kṣatriya castes, some commentators take a different view. Medhātithi[109] states that the term *rājā* does not exclusively mean kṣatriya. Aparārka,[110] Kullūka Bhaṭṭa[111] and Chaṇḍeśvara[112] feel no hesitation in calling a *de facto* king *rājā*. The *Agni Purāṇa* likes to adhere to the old *smṛti* tradition but does not like to close kingship explicitly to other castes.

Other texts[113] regard a kingdom ruled by a boy or a woman as a country not worth living, but the *Agni Purāṇa* does not. It requires the king to be of age and possess knowledge of various branches of learning. It seems from contemporary literature and inscriptions that the minister or one of the near relatives of the boy king acts as regent in his infancy.[114] But this is not favoured by the *Agni Purāṇa*, which quotes the examples of Daśaratha and Yudhiṣṭhira who handed over the throne to their mature successors.

---

[106] *Arth.*, 6.1.

[107] *KNS*, 4.6-8 ; 4.15-19 ; 4.22-23.

[108] *Nītimayūkha*, p.1: *rājaśabdaḥ kṣatriyamātre śakto na rājyayogini ; Rājanītiprakāśa*, p. 11: *rājaśabdaḥ kṣatriyajātivachanaḥ.*

[109] Medhātithi quoted in the *Rājanītiprakāśa*, p. 14: *rājaśabdaścha neh kṣatriyajātivachanaḥ.*

[110] *Rājanītiprakāśa*, pp. 14-15.

[111] Comments on *Manu* 7.1.

[112] *RR*, pp. 2-3 : *vastutastu prajāpālanapravṛttyabhiṣekādayo'sya kāraṇamātraṁ prajāsvāmitve rājatvena prasiddho rājā.*

[113] Someśvaradeva, a little later than our text, requires the king to be of mature age. (*Abhilaṣi.*, I, 2.2.)

[114] Amoghavarṣa (A. D. 814) was a boy of 13 or 14 when he ascended the Rāṣṭrakūṭa throne. His father Govinda III had arranged that Karkka, the viceroy of Gujarat should be his son's regent during his minority. (*Age of Imperial Kannauj*, p.9). Pāla King Vigrahapāla abdicated in favour of his son Nārāyaṇapāla and retired to an ascetic life (*Ibid.*, p. 52-53.

We find that nearly the whole *arthaśāstra* literature including the relevant portion from our *Purāṇa*[115] expects the king to be powerful enough to control his feudatories. The feudal lords seem to be very powerful and at the same time very turbulent in our period[116]. So for the preservation of security and peace, it is considered necessary to keep them under proper check. The feudatories always shifted their allegiance to the stronger power, and those who were powerful tried to establish independent principalities.[117]

The conception of the state in our text is that of a warring state, intent on self-protection or self-aggrandizement. Several chapters are devoted to methods of warfare, six-fold policy, omens and portents combined with many propitiary rituals for victory in the battle. But as self-exertion (*pauruṣa*) is regarded superior to divine favour,[118] the king is advised to be vigorous, firm and brave in battlefield.[119] He is expected to be expert in inter-state affairs.

The king is advised to be just in his dealings with the people.[120] For this purpose only such persons are to be appointed to the law-courts as treat friends and foes alike.[121] Somadeva compares the king's justice with a pair of scale.[122] If the king is not just, the people revolt. Hsüan Tsang records an old tradition according to which Aśoka was afraid of the opinion of the people who would not agree to his excusing his erring brother Mahendra.[123]

Our *Purāṇa* attaches great importance to the popularity of the king among his subjects. It is peoples' love and loyalty which brings territory, land and wealth to the king.[124] The king is, above all, asked to be virtuous, having faith in the *varṇāśrama dharma*, respect for god, cow and brāhmaṇas.

---

[116] *Ibid.*, 239.4 ; Arth., 6.1 ; *KNS*, 4.7 ; *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.3: *vaśyasāmantatā*, I. 2.708: *sāmantānāṁ cha śāsanaṃ.*

[117] *Infra.*

[118] *Agni*, 226.1: *tasmātpauruṣameveha śreṣṭhamāhurmanīṣiṇaḥ.*

[119] *Ibid.*, 225.24: *saṁgrāmeṣvanivartitvam.*

[120] *Ibid.*, 238.11: *prajāḥ samanugṛhṇīyāt.*

[121] *Ibid.*, 253.32: *śatrumitrasamāḥ sabhyā ; VDP*, II. 3.4: *vyavahāre samaḥ prāpte putrasya ripuṇā saha.*

[122] *NVA*, 27.1: *guṇadoṣayostulādaṇḍasamo rājā.*

[123] Beal, *Travels of Hiouen-Thsang*, 1958, p. 321. 'If I excuse you, I fear the opinion of the people.

[124] *Agni*, 225.33: *janānurāgaprabhavā rājño rājyamahīśriyaḥ,*

It will be seen that, of the many qualifications enumerated by our *Purāṇa*, some can make him famous and popular not only in his own kingdom but in the enemy's country as well. This indicates the influence of the *arthaśāstra-smṛti* tradition on the compiler of our *Purāṇa*.

Education of the Prince:

The early Hindu scriptures provide emancipation from this world only for those who beget sons. This is more important for the king, especially where succession is hereditary. For the continuance of the royal dynasty in a patriarchal society and for smooth succession to the throne, it becomes necessary for the king to procreate a son or beget a son even through levirate (*niyoga*). The anxiety of the king for a male successor is hinted at even in our *Purāṇa*, which refers to Daśaratha's sacrifice for son (*putra kāmeṣṭhi yajña*)[125] and the practice of levirate by Ambikā, Ambālikā and Kuntī.[126] Somadeva Sūri prescribes the protection of the queen for maintaining the purity of the lineage.[127] Jayasiṁha Siddharāja, the Great (A.D. 1096-1143), built temples, made gifts to brāhmaṇas, and went on pilgrimage to Somanātha on foot only for a male issue.[128] The king confers the state on his successor as a sacred trust. But the prince cannot be worthy of the same if he is not well-trained. Somadeva[129] prefers the anarchy of a kingless state to the rule of a king who is illiterate. Even the people, according to him, do not like the installation of such a prince as is considered as an unpolished gem. So our *Purāṇa*, like other works on *arthaśāstra* and *dharmaśāstra*[130], lays stress on the proper training of the princes. It states that humility and discipline gained through study begets kingdom.

The *Agni Purāṇa*[131] lays down that princes are to be taught *dharmaśāstra*, *arthaśāstra*, science of erotics (*kāmaśāstra*), archery (*dhanurveda*) besides the use of chariots, elephants, arts and crafts, and daily exercises. It further prescribes four traditional subjects, *ānvīkṣikī*, *daṇḍanīti*, *trayī* and *vārtā*, the study of which is considered to be essential for the king by Daṇḍin[132] and Somadeva Sūri[133]. Our text does not discuss the relative importance of these subjects. But Kauṭilya and Kāmandaka[134] state that the school of Manu knows of only three sciences, *ānvīkṣikī* being merely a branch of *trayī*; the school of Bṛhaspati considers *vārtā* and *daṇḍanīti* to be essential for temporal affairs, and the school of Uśanasa attaches importance only to *daṇḍanīti* as all other sciences originate from it and are comprehended by it. Kauṭilya declares that the knowledge of all the four sciences is essential for the king, which is accepted by our text.

---

[125] *Agni*, 5.5.

[126] *Ibid.*, 12.7-8 and 12.9-10.

[127] *NVA*, 24.27.

[128] *Gūrjara Deśa.*, Bombay. 1955. Vol. II, p. 329.

[129] *NVA*, 5.37-38 : *varamarājakaṁ bhuvanaṁ na tu mūrkhorājā...*

[130] *Agni*, 225.1-4, 238.8-9 ; *VDP*, II. 65.2-8 ; *Arth.*, 1.2-5 ; *KNS*, 2.1-17 ; *Bārhaspatyasūtra*, 2.5-6 ; *NVA*, 5.31-63, chapts. 6, 7, 8, and 9, 11.4-20 ; *Abhilaṣi.*, III. 12.1342-1365, etc.

[131] *Ibid.*, 225.21-22 and 238.9.

Ānvīkṣikī is interpreted differently by various writers on polity. For Kauṭilya it comprehends the philosophies of the *Sāṁkhya, Yoga,* and *Lokāyata* schools. The *Amarakośa,* Viśvarūpāchārya, Haradatta and others take it in the sense of logic (*tarkavidyā*). It means metaphysics (*ātmavidyā*) according to Kāmandaka, the *Viṣṇudharmottara,* the *Matsya* and the *Mitākṣarā*[135]; according to Nīlkaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa logic and *vedānta* come under it. But our *Purāṇa*[136] quotes verses in connection with *ānvīkṣikī verbatim* from Kāmandaka and the *Viṣṇudharmottara,* and yet interprets it to mean *arthavijñāna* (worldly affairs). This is also supported by Somadeva Sūri[137], who equates it with the *Lokāyata* doctrines and states that its study by the king helps him to weed out the thorns of the state.

Trayī stands for the three Vedas, *Ṛk, Sāma* and *Yajus.* According to Kauṭilya it includes the *Atharvaveda, Itihāsaveda* and the six limbs of the Vedas (*vedāṅgas*), besides the three Vedas enumerated above.[138] *Itihāsa,* according to him, comprehends the study of the *Purāṇas,* history (*itivṛtta*), tales (*ākhyāyikā*), illustrative examples (*udāharaṇa*), *dharmaśāstra* and the science of wealth (*arthaśāstra*)[139]. In other words he makes *trayī* synonymous with the traditional fourteen sciences of learning. Kāmandaka and Somadeva Sūri[140] offer a similar meaning of the term *trayī,* but they leave out *arthaśāstra* and include *nyāya* and

---

[132] *Daśakumāracharita,* NSP, 1928, VIII. para 1, page 256: *chatasrorājavidyāstrayīvartānvīkṣikīdaṇḍanītiḥ.*

[133] *NVA,* 5.55: *ānvīkṣikī trayī vārtā daṇḍanītiriti chatasro rājavidyāḥ.*

[134] *Arth.,* 1.2; *KNS,* 2.3-6.

[135] *HDS,* Vol. III, pp. 47-48; *VDP,* II. 65.46.

[136] 225.22: *ānvīkṣikīṁ chārthavidyāṁ;* 238.9: *ānvīkṣikyā'rthavijñānaṁ.*

[137] *NVA,* 6.32-33: *aihikavyavahāraprasādhanaparaṁ lokāyatikaṃ lokāyatajño hi rājā rāṣṭrakaṇṭakāmuchchhedayati.*

[138] *Arth.,* 1.3.

[139] *Ibid.,* 1.5.

[140] *KNS,* 2.13; *NVA,* 7.1.

mimāṁsā in its place and treat the *Itihāsa* and the *Purāṇa* as a single subject. Our own text[141] provides us with a list of fourteen branches of learning similar to Kāmandaka, the *Nītivākyāmṛta* and the *Viṣṇudharmottara*. Thus the king is required to be well versed in the *Vedas* and their allied literature. Their study is essential to the prince or the future king for knowing the rules of society based on caste and stage theory, and it helps him to decide what is wrong and what is right[142].

Our *Purāṇa* repeats the *Arthaśāstra* aphorism to explain the term *vārtā*. It means the study of expedients and obstacles in economic pursuits.[143] It also states that *vārtā* deals with the knowledge of worldly affairs.[144] Our *Purāṇa*, however, does not specify the economic pursuits covered by '*vārtā*', as is done by Kauṭilya, Kāmandaka, Somadeva Sūri, etc.[145] Somadeva states that if *vārtā* prospers, the king prospers. He seems to imply that the king should learn to regulate agriculture, weights, measures and price control, and foster trade and industry.[146]

All texts on polity emphasize the study of *daṇḍanīti* or the science of government, which helps to discriminate between the just and the unjust.[147] Its study helps the king in protecting the virtuous and punishing the wicked.[148] The *Agni Purāṇa* describes the king as the wielder of the sceptre of justice (*sudaṇḍavān*) and adds that without a proper use of punishment the balance cannot be maintained in society; accordingly it draws attention to the need of the cultivation of this branch of knowledge.[149]

Besides these four essential branches of knowledge, *dhanurveda* is prescribed as a subject of study by the prince. It does not mean only archery, but training in various kinds of arms and weapons besides it. It is counted as an *upa-veda*.[150] The *Agni Purāṇa*, on the basis of the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, devotes four chapters[151] to this subject. Even in

---

141 219.59-60 ; *VDP*, II. 22.132-133.

142 *Agni*, 238.9: *dharmādharmau trayīsthitau* ; cf. *NVA*, 7.2: *trayītaḥ khalu varṇāśramaṇāṁ dharmādharmavyavasthā.*

143 *Ibid.*, 238.8: *arthānarthau tu vārtāyāṁ* ; cf. *Arth.*, 1.4 ; *KNS*, 2.7.

144 *Ibid.*, 225.22: *vārtārambhāṁścha lokataḥ.*

145 *Arth.*, 1.4 ; *KNS*, 2.14: *paśupālyaṁ kṛṣiḥ paṇyaṃ vārttā vārtānujīvināṃ; NVA*, 8.1: *kṛṣiḥ paśupālanam vāṇijyā cha vārtā vaiśyānām.*

146 *NVA*, chapt. 8, 8.2: *vārtāsamṛddhau sarvāḥ samṛddhayo rājñaḥ*·

147 *Agni*. 238.9.

148 *NVA*, 5.60: *daṇḍanītiḥ sādhupālanaduṣṭanigrahaḥ.*

149 *Agni*, 218.2 and 226.15.

150 *Ibid.*, 219.59.

151 *Ibid.*. chapts. 249-252.

late life the king is asked to practise various arms and to take physical exercise daily.[152] The royal prince is asked to be expert in riding horses, elephants, chariots, and other conveyances, perhaps because he is expected to command the army in the battlefield.

Our *Purāṇa* lays down that a brāhmaṇa teacher should teach military science to the two higher castes.[153] It further states that trusted teachers should be appointed to train them. Thus the profession of teaching is restricted to brāhmaṇas[154] on the model of the old *smṛti* tradition. Our text lends sacred nature to *dhanurveda* by prescribing its teaching in a sacrificial shed.[155] The discussion of the methods of training in our *Purāṇa* is not so elaborate as we find in Kauṭilya, the *Kādambarī* and the *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi.* Kauṭilya advises that the princes should be associated with teachers of acknowledged authority (*śiṣṭa*), various heads of government departments, and theoretical and practical politicians[156] for specialised training in *ānvīkṣikī*, *trayī*, *vārtā* and *daṇḍanīti* respectively. Somadeva Sūri[157] entrusts the duty of training the princes in the art of oration, various scripts, arithmetic, literature, logic, grammar, science of government, science of erotics, gems, the science of using various weapons, horses and elephants, etc., to the royal priests. In his opinion the teachers of the prince are to be of illustrious family, good lineage, pure character and learning as the character of the teacher leaves a stamp on that of his pupil.[158]

Distribution of curriculum in various stages, made by Kauṭilya[159] and hinted at in the *Nītivākyāmṛta*,[160] is not found in our *Purāṇa*. It does not indicate the system and method of examination, ending with the convocation ceremony (*samāvartana*)[161] and the gift of cows, as Someśvaradeva does. Someśvaradeva prescribes examination of the princes in scriptures (*śruti*), science of government (*nīti*), logic, literature (*kāvya*), grammar, military science (*dhanurveda*), some science relating to land

---

[152] *Ibid.*, 235.13: *mantraṁ kṛtvā'atha vyāyāmam chakre yāne cha śastrake*; *NVA*. 25.15-19.

[153] *Agni*, 249.7: *dhanurvede gururvipraḥ prokto varṇadvayasya cha.*

[154] *Ibid.*, 151.6.

[155] *Ibid.*, 250.1: *sunirdhauta dhanuḥ kṛtvā yajñabhūmau vidhāpayet.*

[156] *Arth.*, 1.5.

[157] *NVA*, 11.4: *śikṣālāpakriyākṣamo rājaputraḥ sarvāsu lipisu prasaṁkhyāne padapramāṇaprayogakarmaṇi nītyāgameṣu ratnaparīkṣayāṁ sambhogaprahariṇopavāhya vidyāsu cha sādhu vinetavyaḥ.*

[158] *Ibid.*, 5.65 and 5.70.

[159] *Arth.*, 1.5.

[160] *NVA*, 11.28.

[161] *Abhilaṣi.*, III. 12.1342-1365.

(*bhūmibala*), phonetics (*svaraśāstra*), arts (*kalā*), different feats of archery (*chāpavidyā*) the use of various weapons and elephants, and horse-riding. He states that the princes should be tested in experience (*pāṭavaṁ*), strength (*bala*), prudence (*prajñā*) and practical feats (*kalākauśala*).

Our *Purāṇa*[162] enjoins the princes to be on guard against association with angry, greedy and degraded persons, for it gives rise to rebellious tendencies in them. So the king is advised to appoint persons to secretly watch the movements of the princes on the pretext of defending their person.[163] It further lays down that princes incapable of learning should be kept in cells of pleasure and those who are humble and educated should be appointed to supervise various departments of the state.[164]

The curriculum of prince's education in our *Purāṇa* exactly tallies with the training of Chandrāpīḍa described by Bāṇa in his *Kādambarī*.[165] Prince Chandrāpīḍa is sent to a school situated outside the village at the age of six and receives education there for ten years under expert teachers. During this period Chandrāpīḍa gains proficiency in grammar, *mīmāṁsā*, logic, science of law, various branches of political science, in the use of difficult weapons, in instrumental music, various scripts and dialects of the country, all the mechanical arts, the Vedas and in many different branches.[166] Similar subjects are enumerated by Daṇḍin. But strangely enough he includes gambling, thieving and similar other crooked arts learnt by the princes at the court of Rājavāhana.[167] Kālidāsa refers to fourteen traditional branches of learning being taught to Raghu by the brāhmaṇa scholar Vartantu.

It is difficult to say whether all the kings received education as prescribed in our *Purāṇa*.[168] We may quote some instances from early medieval times. Harṣa shows his knowledge of literature through his three extant dramas—the *Ratnāvali*, the *Priyadarśikā*, and the *Nāgānanda*, Pravarasena II, Mahendravarman, Yaśovarman, Mihira Bhoja and other such kings add to the list of scholar kings. This tradition continued even after our period. Muñja[169] is praised for his knowledge of all the branches of learning, while his nephew, king Bhoja of Dhāra[170] was a versatile scholar, expert in *dharmaśāstra*, *āyurveda*, grammar, poetry, *nītiśāstra*, etc. Even a king of smaller principality, Mṛgendravarman of the Kadamba dynasty, is praised for his sharp intellect and liberal outlook gained through a study of different branches of learning. He is said to have developed a fine physique through military and physical exercises and riding of horse and elephant.[171]

---

[162] *Agni.*, 225.3: *na chāsya saṅgo dātavyaḥ kruddhalubdhavimānitaiḥ.*

[163] *Ibid.*, 225.2.

[164] *Ibid.*, 225.3-4.

[165] *Kādambarī*, para 71 pp. 168-169.

[166] *CA*, p. 584n.

[167] *Daśakumāracharita*. NSP. 1951, pp. 23-24.

[168] It seems to be an ideal which every great emperor tried to achieve. The Hāthigumphā Inscription informs us that king Khāravela had learnt royal correspondence, currency (*lekhya*), accounts (*gaṇana*), law (*vyavahāra*), municipal laws (*vidhi*), *dharmaśāstra* and music, (*gāndharvaveda*) before he became the crownprince. Even the Śaka kings strove for this ideal, and Rudradāman was famous for his study, memory and use of the rules of grammar, science of words and their meanings, music, logic (*nyāya*) and other branches of learning. He was expert in use of horse, elephant, chariot, sword and shield, and in wrestling. The Allahabad Pillar Inscription and the coins of Samudra-gupta testifies to his knowledge of literature and music.

Thus although our *Purāṇa* follows the old *arthaśāstra-smṛti* tradition in laying down the curriculum of education for the future king, it lays emphasis on the study of the science of wealth. How far this view of the *Agni Purāṇa* prevailed, we have no means to find out.

Coronation Ceremony:

The *Agni Purāṇa*, like other early texts,[172] seems to attach a great importance to the coronation of the king. Its *Rājadharma* section opens with this ritual, which is described in some detail. It uses the term consecrated (*murdhābhiṣikta*) as a synonym of the king,[173] which suggests that coronation bestows sovereignty on him. Pṛthu is the first consecrated monarch. It is said that the gods Hari and Brahmā[174] annointed him with *rājasūya* rituals which made him the overlord of the whole universe.[175] Describing the kings of the lunar race our *Purāṇa* quotes perhaps an old story which relates that the performance of the *rājasūya* endowed Soma with uncomparable power and lusture as well as the overlordship of the seven regions. It made the arms and curse of such gods as Nārāyaṇa, Bibhāvasu, Dhātāra (god of fate), Prabhākara

---

[169] *Gūrjara Deśa.*, Vol. I, p. 162.

[170] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 289-90.

[171] *IA*, VII, p. 37.

[172] (i) *Matsya*, quoted by the *Rājanītiprakāśa*, p. 13.
(ii) Kullūka Bhaṭṭa on Manu, 7.1: *rājaśabdo'pi nātra kṣatriyajātivachanaḥ kintvābhiṣiktajana padapurapālayitṛpuruṣavachanaḥ* ; (iii) *Nītimayūkha*, p. 1 ;
(iv) *Rājadharmakaustubha*, p. 338: *abhisekātpurvamapirājaśabdo nānupapannaḥ, aveṣṭyadhi karaṇanayāyena jātivāchakatvāta.*

[173] *Agni*, 366.1,

[174] *Ibid.*. 19.22.

[175] *Ibid.*, 18.15.

(sun god), Haviṣmanta (god of fire), Jayanta and Nāndi ineffective against Soma, who ravished their wedded wives.[176] We do not find any indication of the political importance of the *vājapeya* sacrifice as noticed by earlier literature.[177] Some important pieces of information can be inferred from this short anecdote. First, the absence of the terms *vājapeya* and *rājasūya* coupled with the details of coronation ceremony in the chapters on polity shows the decline of the Vedic sacrifices as against the growth of complex Purāṇic rituals in our period. Secondly, in later times the *rājasūya* began to be considered as conferring not only kingship but paramountcy over all. Above all, it shows the ineffectiveness or helplessness of the people against the lust and greed of the monarch. Public will is subordinated to the sanctity attached to the annointed king, who is as important as a god. The spells to be chanted during the *rājasūya* are the same as in installing an idol and are thought to be capable of expiating all sorts of sins.[178]

Five types of coronation are provided in our text:

(i) consecration of the crown prince (*yauvarājyābhiṣeka*) by the reigning monarch,
(ii) abdication of throne by the king in favour of a prince,
(iii) provisional installation of the prince on the throne without waiting for an auspicious occasion in the event of the king's death,
(iv) permanent annointing of the king-elect, and finally,
(v) the annual consecration of the reigning monarch.

The first two types of coronation, installation of the crown prince and abdication of the king in favour of prince, find only stray references in our *Purāṇa* when it summarises the two great epics—the *Rāmāyaṇa*[179] and the *Mahābhārata*.[180] The only reference to the consecration of the crown prince is the incomplete coronation of Rāmachandra. Only three or four stages of the ceremony are dealt with, for soon Rama goes to the forest.

An analysis of this consecration brings out the following main points: (i) people's will to install Rāma as the king, (ii) king's consideration for the popular will,[181] (iii) consultation with the council of ministers including the chief priest by the king about the proposed consecration of Rāma and a request to them to make necessary arrangements,[182] and (iv) instruction to Rāma to exercise self-control in relations with his wife in the night preceding the coronation.[183] The word '*dadāmi*'[184] is very important as it denotes the reigning monarch's right to give away the kingdom to any of his sons, but public opinion is not ignored. It is the public will to install Rāma that prompts Daśaratha to hand over the office of the heir-apparent to him. Furthermore, he feels that he would be blamed by the people if he pleases Kaikeyi by nominating Bharata his heir-apparent.[185] N. N. Law critically examines the view of Jagannātha Tarkapañchānana, who holds that the reigning monarch had absolute power to give away his kingdom as he liked. Law rightly accepts Hopkins, conclusion that 'if there are two (or more) healthy sons the king had no allowed right to select other than the eldest as heir, and if he exceeded his right in this regard the people openly and threateningly called him to account for his departure.'[186] In any case the consecration of the eldest son as heir-apparent does not seem to be the rule according to our *Purāṇa*. Kāmandaka advises the monarch to install his modest son to the post of the heir-apparent.[187] The *Agni Purāṇa* seems to endorse this by stating that the king should appoint his humble son to all posts of responsibility.[188]

---

[176] *Ibid.*, 274.2-7.
[177] The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* prescribes the *vājapeya* for universal overlordship and the *rājasūya* sacrifice for kingship. For detail consult N. N. Law's *Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity*, Oxford, 1921, pp. 18-19.
[178] *Agni*, 219.1: *rājadevādyabhiṣekamantrānvakṣye'ghamardanān.*
[179] Chapts. 5-11.
[180] Chapts. 12-15.

The appointment of the heir-apparent is linked up with the question of royal succession. Chaṇḍeśvara, a commentator of the early 14th century, treats the consecration of heir-apparent in some detail, and quotes the views of an unknown work, the *Rājanīti*, on succession.[189] According to it right of succession passes from the eldest son to the eldest son's son and in their absence to the youngest son, and even a near relative. It seems that the rule of primogeniture is prominent but sometimes any son born on a wife belonging to his own caste (*aurasa*), a younger brother, a younger cousin, an elder brother's son, any son, a grandson who has been made a son, and adopted son are also considered for succession. Neither our text nor any other near contemporary work on polity recommends another coronation ceremony for the crown prince when he ascends the throne.

---

[181] 6.2: *guṇānurāgādrājye tvaṁ prajābhirabhiṣechitaḥ, manasā'ham prabhāte te yauvarājyaṁ dadāmi ha.*

[182] 6.3-4 and 6.6.

[183] 6.3.

[184] 6.2: *yauvarājyaṁ dadāmi...*

[185] 6.24: *kevalaṁ tvatpriyaṃ kṛtvā bhaviṣyāmi suninditaḥ.*

[186] Law, N. N., *op. cit.*, pp. 51-58; for Hopkins' view see *JAOS*, XIII, pp. 139-44 and for Jagannātha Tarkapañchānan's, see *Colebrooke's Digest*, I, pp. 414-20.

[187] *KNS*, 7.6: *vinītamaurasaṁ putraṁ yauvarājye abhiṣechayet* ; cf. *Arth.*, 1.17.

[188] *Agni*, 225.4: *adhikāreṣu sarveṣu vinītaṁ viniyojayet.*

[189] *RR*, p. 73: *abhiṣichya vidhānena dharmmajaṁ vikṣya lakṣaṇaṃ, tatsutaṃ tatkaniṣṭhādikramātkāmajamātmajam, sannikṛṣṭānvayaṁ chānyaṃ prajāviprānumoditam.*

The second type of consecration ceremony, consequent on the abdication of the throne in favour of his son by the king, is only referred to in our text, but no light is thrown on the procedure followed in such a case. Yudhiṣṭhira installs Parīkṣita on the throne before going to the Himālayas with other Pāṇḍavas for final emancipation.[190] Early literature, on the pattern of the four *āśrama* theory, glorifies a king, who in his old days hands over his office to the crown prince and retires to the forest with or without his wife.[191] Except one stray reference to the coronation of Parīkṣita, nothing is known about the main ceremony in such cases. But probably, the whole coronation rituals are to be gone through. Chaṇḍeśvara discusses the coronation of a successor in the lifetime of the monarch, which, compared to the coronation rituals of our text, is brief; those in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Nītimayūkha* are far more elaborate. Here we find that the king or his chief priest enters the sacrificial hall (*yajñamaṇḍapa*) in white dress after his daily ablutions and places a golden pitcher filled with holy water and twigs of five different trees. He invokes Varuṇa in the pitcher and then worships Śrī, Viṣṇu, Umā, Śiva, Gaṇapati, the planets (*graha*), and gods of the ten quarters with offerings of clarified butter (*ghee*) in the fire. The king then makes him sit on the tiger-skin and sprinkles the holy water with twigs of tree over him in the presence of his friends, brāhmaṇas, merchants, traders, ministers, and relations. The prince is then seated on the throne and decorated with sandal-paste, fillet, head-dress, costumes and jewels set with precious stones. He is offered royal umbrella, fly-whisks (*chāmara*), sandals, etc. The king then hands over the remaining six elements of the state to him and announces thus—'From today this kingdom does not belong to me. This is the king who will protect the subjects.'[192] He calls upon the people to witness the transfer of sovereignty in the form of Viṣṇu.[193] We find this type of coronation described in contemporary Jain literature. King Yaśorgha thinks it necessary to marry his son Yaśodhara and install him as king before he proceeds to lead a monastic life. The commander-in-chief Pratāpavardhana with the help of an architect makes the requisite preparation. A new township is built and fully decorated on the bank of the Śiprā. An elephant and a horse are selected by an expert committee. The astrologer fixes auspicious time for marriage and coronation. As regards the coronation, pitchers of gold and silver, various herbs, *kuśa* and holy water from big rivers are kept ready. Several courtezans sprinkle the holy water over Yaśodhara's head in the midst of the recital of appropriate verses by a bard. Accession to the throne and presentation of royal insignia such as umbrella, royal turban and sword, and royal procession through the main streets of the capital form the chief features of the consecration of the crown prince Yaśodhara.[194]

---

[190] *Agni*, 14.28: *rājye parīkṣitaṃ sṭhāpya sānujaḥ svargamāptavān*: 15.11.

[191] *Viṣṇu, P.*, V. 23.5 the consecration of Kālayavana by his father; III. 9.18; *Raghuvaṁśa*, 1.8; *Anargharāghava*, pp. 254-255: *raghurājadharmādhikārasarvadhurīṇaḥ śiśurapivatso'yam tadasmiñjarsa durvahaṁ varṇāśramābhāramaropya vayamapi kvāpi tapovane dilīpakulochitena vidhinā śeṣamāyu rupabubhukṣāmahe*; *Rājanīti* quoted by Chaṇḍeśvara in RR, p. 73: *yauvarājye'thva rājye yadi rājā vimatsaraḥ abhiṣichya vidhānena* . .

Other three types of consecration are borrowed by our text from the *Viṣṇudharmottara* with slight variations. In the event of the king's death it provides for a tentative consecration of the heir-apparent, which is necessarily short and emergent.[195] This is done perhaps to set at rest all speculation about succession and possible confusion consequent upon the death of the king. We are reminded here of Kauṭilya who advises the ministers to guard the secret of the king's death till the accession of the successor to the throne or till the heir-apparent is able to settle down to administration.[196] The throne is never kept vacant perhaps due to the fear of anarchy of a kingless state. In the absence of the rightful successor Rāmachandra, his sandals ruled and Bharata acted only as its regent.[197] During the interregnum of eighteen days between the death of the Chaulukya king Siddharāja and the accession of Kumārapāla, the sandals of the former king reigned perhaps on the same analogy.[198] Even today we have the British principle of monarchy,

---

[192] *RR.* -p.74: *ādyārabhya na me rājyaṁ rājā'yaṁ rakṣatu prajā.*

[193] *Ibid.*, p. 74: *iti sarvaṁ prajāviṣṇuṃ sākṣiṇam śrāvayenmuhuḥ.*

[194] Handiqui, K. K., *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, pp. 26-28.

[195] *Agni*, 218.5 ; cf. *VDP*. II. 18.2.

[196] *Arth.*, 5.6.

[197] *Agni*, 6.51.

[198] Sūri Svaprabhā, *Kumārapāla-pratibodha*, (GOS) p. 33: *Pattane pādukā-rājyaṁ maraṇam siddhabhūpateh.*

'The King is dead ; long live the King'. The traditional Indian principle presupposes political contest, but the British theory indicates its absence as the line of succession is fixed in advance by the Parliament. Our *Purāṇa* asks the astrologer and the priest to consecrate the successor of the dead king without waiting for an auspicious occasion. Consequently the ceremony it prescribes is very simple. They sprinkle sessamum seeds (*tīla*) and white mustard along with water over his head and shout victory to the king. The king, from the throne, then announces protection to all and general amnesty to prisoners.[199]

The formal and permanent coronation of such a king is held after a year of his accession to the throne.[200] The astrologer, the priest, the officiating *ṛtvija*, ministers and the chief queen are nominated by the king-elect in advance.[201] The chief queen (*mahiṣī*) is consecrated along with the king.[202] As a sacrifice, according to the Hindu scriptures, is not successful without the presence of the wife, our text makes the nomination of the chief queen a prerequisite for the coronation ; the *Rājadharmakaustubha*, however, prescribes a subsequent consecration of the chief queen, when the king is married afterwards.[203] Others including the ministers are appointed perhaps to advise the king and make arrangements for his coronation. Śivājī following this traditional rule appointed his council of eight ministers (*aṣṭapradhāna*) before his installation as king. We find the chief of the army and other high officers making arrangements for the coronation rituals even in the Yaśastilaka.[204]

The coronation proper as described by our *Purāṇa* may be summarised as follows:—

(i) propitiation of Indra (*aindriśānti*) ;

(ii) oblations to sacrificial fire with spells relating to Viṣṇu, Indra, Savitar, Vaiśvadevatā, Saumya, and Aparājitā by the fasting priest ;

(iii) rubbing of the different parts of the king-elect's body with soils brought from different places (*mṛttikāsnāna*) ;

---

[199] *Agni*, 218.5-6 ; *VDP*, II. 18.2-4.

[200] *Ibid.*, 218.4 ; *Eng.Tr.*, Vol. II, p. 780.

[201] *Ibid.*, 218.3.

[202] *Ibid.*, 360.76: *rājā bhaṭṭārako devaḥ sābhiṣekā cha devyapi.*

[203] GOS. 1935, p. 248: *rājñā saha agramahisī abhiṣektavyā athavā abhiṣiktena rājñā paśchāt svayamabhiṣektavyā.*

[204] *Yaśastilaka Champūmahākāvya*, ed. and tr. Sundarlāla Śāstrī, Banaras, 1960, pp. 162-204.

(iv) washing his head with five holy compositions called *pañcha-gavya* ;

(v) annointing by high officers (*amātyas*) belonging to the four castes, i.e. brāhmaṇa, kṣatriya, vaiśya and śūdra with clarified butter, milk, curd and water, contained in jars of gold, silver, copper and earth from the four quarters respectively ;

(vi) sprinkling of honey and washing of *kuśa* grass by the brāhmaṇas belonging to the Ṛgvedic and Sāmavedic schools ;

(vii) chanting of spells (*mantras*) which are recited at the time of the *rājasūyābhiṣeka* by the brāhmaṇas ;

(viii) sprinkling of water over the head of the king-elect from a golden jar having hundred holes by the chief priest ;

(ix) the ritual of the *Yajurveda* and *Atharvaveda* such as offering of sandal paste, rice, flowers, etc., with respective spells ;

(x) pouring waters from all the holy places over the king's head by the brāhmaṇas ;

(xi) looking at auspicious things such as a pitcher full of medicinal herbs (*sarvauṣadhi*), mirror, clarified butter, etc. ;

(xii) worship of Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Indra, etc., and the planets (*graha*) ;

(xiii) tieing of a fillet of gold to the king's forehead (*paṭṭabandha*) and putting the crown on his head (*mukuṭabandha*) and making him sit on a cushion made of the skin of five animals (bull, tiger, lion, etc.) ;

(xiv) introduction of high officers (*amātya*), ministers (*sachiva*), etc. to the newly crowned king by the warder (*pratīhāra*)[205] ;

(xv) various kinds of gift to the chief astrologer, the chief priest and other representatives of brāmaṇas assembled there ;[206]

(xvi) circumbulation of fire and worship of bull, cow with calf, horse and elephant ;[207]

(xvii) coronation procession and military parade through the main streets of the capital ;[208] and

(xviii) return of the procession to the palace, and close of the ceremony after making gifts.[209]

---

[205] *Agni*, 218.31: *amātyasachivādiṁścha pratīhāraḥ pradarśayet.*
[206] *Ibid.*, 218.32.
[207] *Ibid.*, 218.33.
[208] *Ibid.*. 218.34: *paribhramedrājamārge balayuktaḥ pradakṣiṇam.*
[209] *Ibid.*, 218.35.

The description of these rituals in our *Purāṇa* is followed by a whole chapter containing spells to be used on the occasion of the coronation ceremony of the king and the god.[210] They are thought to be capable of destroying all kinds of sins. It is not clear from our text when these spells are to be used in the ceremony. One of the manuscripts of our *Purāṇa*, referred to in the Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series adds at the end of the chapter 218 that after performing these rites properly the king should undergo royal consecration.[211] The compiler of this manuscript seemingly regards the *mantras* in the following chapter as constituting a separate and important ritual. But they are nothing but invocations to various gods, celestial bodies, mother goddesses, different divisions of time, divine horse and elephant, weapons, fourteen *manus, gandharvas, apsarases, rākṣasas, piśāchas, siddhas, bhūtas,* the great sages, illustrious monarchs of antiquities, fourteen different branches of learning, the different divisions of the universe, sacred rivers and places of pilgrimage to sprinkle the newly crowned king and to make his rule stable. The *Nītimayūkha*[212] uses these *mantras* as benedictory verses, chanted at the time of the sprinkling of water from the sacrificial pitcher by the chief astrologer. So these spells together with the sprinkling of water seem to be used as *śāntyābhiṣeka.*[213] The variant text of our *Purāṇa* does not fit with the ritual as a whole because a fresh consecration with these spells after the closure of the main function seems to be absurd.

Our *Purāṇa* does not discuss the auspicious and inauspicious occasions for the coronation, but the *Viṣṇudharmottara*[214] has a chapter of fourteen verses dealing with this topic. It states that the successor of a dead king should be crowned without waiting for an auspicious time.[215] It implies that such a time is fixed by the astrologer in a normal case of coronation. Only brāhmaṇas annoint the king in our *Purāṇa*,[216] but the *Viṣṇudharmottara* extends this privilege to the four castes along with the chief courtezan. Nīlkaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa goes further to include even persons of mixed castes, though born of *anuloma* marriage, in this function.[217] Thus the one shows an orthodox approach, and the other a growing liberalism. Our text asks the warder to present high officers (*amātyas*) and ministers (*sachivas*), etc. to the newly crowned king but does not specify whether chief administrators of the towns (*paur-mukhyāḥ*), heads of corporate bodies or guilds (*naigamāḥ*), and big merchants and traders (*vaṇigvarāḥ*) as also other people are also to be introduced to him.[218] It may either indicate less political importance of these elements or an attempt at brevity on the part of the compiler of our *Purāṇa*. Instead of recounting them separately he uses the term *ādi* or etc. Similarly, unlike the *Viṣṇudharmottara*,[219] he does not refer to the participation of the chief minister (*mukhyāmātya*), feudal lords (*sāmanta*) along with the chief astrologer and the chief priest in the coronation procession. Their place is taken by the military force (*bala*). Contemporary Jain writer Somadeva Sūri describes traffic arrangements and security measures in the coronation procession being supervised by soldiers,[220] which again shows the importance of military element in the administrative set-up of our period.

---

[210] *Ibid.*, chapt. 219.

[211] *Ibid.*, 218.35 (variant): *evaṁ kṛtva tu vidhivadrājyābhiṣekamācharet.*

[212] *Nītimayūkha*, pp. 34-42.

[213] The *VDP* has 182 such *ślokas* while the *Nītimayūkha* has 180 and our text 71.

[214] II. chapt. 18.

[215] *Agni*, 218.5.

[216] *Ibid.*, 218.26 ; cf. *VDP*, II. 21.18-24.

According to the *Agni Purāṇa* the formal coronation of the king is held within a year of his accession. This provision is made, perhaps, to select auspicious time and to make necessary arrangements. The idea may be also to find out whether the new king is able to win the affection and the loyalty of the people.

Our *Purāṇa* asks the king to release the prisoners on the occasion of his coronation ceremony,[221] which is an old practice recommended by Kauṭilya,[222] and was actually followed by Aśoka, who claims to have made twenty-five jail deliveries within twenty-five years of his coronation.[223]

Lastly, it is difficult to understand the different rituals and spells associated with the coronation unless we look into the source from which they are taken. The verses are so recklessly borrowed, summarised and sometimes miscopied by the compiler of our text from the

---

[217] *Nītimayūkha*, pp. 18-19.

[218] *Agni*, 218.31: *amātyasachivādiṁścha pratīhāraḥ pradarśayet*; cf. *VDP*, II. 21.36-37.

[219] *Ibid.*, 218-34: *paribhramedrājamārge balayūktaḥ pradakṣiṇam*; cf. *VDP*, II. 21.44: *ārūhya rājamārgeṇa svapuraṁ tu paribhramet, mukhyāmātyaiścha sāmantaiḥ sāṁvatsarapurohitaiḥ*.

[220] Handiqui, K. K., *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, p. 26.

[221] *Agni*, 218.14.

[222] *Arth.*, 2.36.

[223] Mookerji, R. K. *Aśoka*. Delhi, 1955. p. 181 Pillar Edict. 5.

Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa that it does not help us to know the full details. One of the glaring examples, we find, is the statement '*rājaśriya'bhiṣeke cha ye mantrāḥ parikīrtitāḥ*.'[224] The meaning of this verse becomes clear only if we take account of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* where it is '*rājasūyābhiṣeke tu ye mantrāḥ parikīrtitāḥ*.'[225]

The consecration of the king including his flag, horse, elephant, swords, etc. forms an annual feature. It is repeated on the occasion of every anniversary of the king's coronation.[226] This annual feature is elaborated in two separate chapters (267-268). Prayers are made to the royal insignia to protect the king and lead him to victory. The *Viṣṇudharmottara*[227] devotes a chapter, though including only three verses, to annual coronation. However, it is the latter which is the source of our text.

Daily routine of the King:

Like other works on polity, our *Purāṇa* prescribes a daily routine for the king. In order to carry out his duties, he is asked to be methodical and punctual.[228] Somadeva Sūri states that the king should set apart the various parts of the day and night for his different works for his self-satisfaction. He further opines that deviation from the time-table is despicable like death. The *Agni Purāṇa* devotes one full chapter to the daily business of the king, though it is not as detailed as the *Viṣṇudharmottara*. Our text does not divide the day and night into various parts for performing different duties, as is done by Kauṭilya.

According to the *Agni Purāṇa* the duties to be performed by the king daily are enumerated in the following order:—

(i) rising forty-eight minutes (two *muhūrtas*) before daybreak,

(ii) audience with his spies before being seen by anybody,.

(iii) hearing the report on income and expenditure,

(iv) daily ablutions, worship of god, etc. together with making suitable gifts to the brāhmaṇas,

---

[224] *Agni*, 218.22.

[225] *VDP*, II. 21.12.

[226] *Agni*, 269.38-39: *kṛtarakṣaścha viṣṇavādestvabhiṣekaścha vatsare, rājño' bhiṣekaḥ kartavyo daivajñen purodhasā.*

[227] II. chapt. 162; *Brahma Purāṇa* as quoted in the *Rājadharmakāṇḍa of Kṛtyakalpataru*, p. 13: *abhiṣekāhnī yatnena pratisamvatsaraṁ nṛpaḥ.*

[228] *NVA*, 25.68-69: *ātmasukhānurodhena kāryāya naktamahaścha vibhajet. kālaniyamena kāryānuṣṭhānaṁ hi maraṇasamaṁ.*

(v) wearing dress and ornaments, seeing auspicious things such as looking glass, gold, clarified butter, etc.,

(vi) consultation with the astrologer and the physician and receiving blessings of his elders and superiors,

(vii) attending his court and receiving the brāhmaṇas, the high officers, the ministers and the people who are presented to him by the warder (*pratīhāra*).

(viii) hearing daily reports of works and determining the routine of business for the day,

(ix) adjudication of lawsuits,

(x) consultation with his ministers,

(xi) gymnastics and physical exercises,

(xii) mid-day bath, visit to temples and brāhmaṇas, and the sacrificial fire,

(xiii) meal and rest,

(xiv) study of religious scriptures,

(xv) inspection of treasury, army, armoury and stores,

(xvi) evening prayer,

(xvii) deputising spies to various duties, and

(xviii) supper and sleep amidst songs and music.

Thus the compiler of our text shortens the account of the king's daily routine given in the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*.[229] It is nearly the same as we find in the *Manu Smṛti*. Somadeva Sūri discusses only the general code of conduct to be followed by the king in his daily life. But he advises the king to attend to urgent and important work without delay[230] and to personally look into the affairs relating to god, preceptor and religion.[231] Similar but general lists are provided by Manu and Yājñavalkya.[232] We find a parody of the daily time-table of the king, as suggested by Kauṭilya, in the *Daśakumāracharita*.[233] Daṇḍin divides day and night each into eight divisions and allots the following duties to the king:—

Day:— (i) hearing report regarding income and expenditure,

(ii) adjudication of lawsuits,

---

[229] II. 151.1-39.

[230] *NVA*, 25.70-71.

[231] *Ibid.*, 25.76.

[232] *Manu*, 7.145-146, 222-246 and 216; *Yāj.*, 2.327-333.

[233] Law, N. N., *Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity*, 1921, p. 81-82.

(iii) bath and meal,
(iv) collection of revenue,
(v) consultation with ministers,
(vi) amusement and conversation,
(vii) inspection of the army,
and (viii) consultation with commander-in-chief regarding military matters.

Night:— (i) evening worship and interviewing secret agents,
(ii) meal and study of scriptures,
(iii) going to bed amid sound of trumpets,
(iv) and (v) sleep,
(vi) cogitation on scriptures,
(vii) consultation with and deputation of spies,
and (viii) with priest and other brāhmaṇas.

But the time-table is not so light as we find it prescribed in the *Bārhaspatyasūtra*. Here we find that the king devotes only six hours to state affairs and eighteen hours to personal work. It seems that by this time the king further lost his responsibilities and so his authority.

We find the division of king's daily time-table like thus:—

(i) rise in early hours of the day (*brāhma-muhūrta*),
(ii) five *nāḍikās* for religious worship,
(iii) five *nāḍikās* for review of works done,
(iv) ten *nāḍikās* for lawsuits,
(v) five *nāḍikās* for bath,
(vi) three *nāḍikās* for lunch,
(vii) five *nāḍikās* for amusement, etc.,
(viii) two *nāḍikās* for religious worship in the evening,
(ix) seven *nāḍikās* for dance, etc.,
(x) seven *nāḍikās* for supper, sexual intercourse, etc.,
and (xi) seven *nāḍikās* for sleep.

A comparison of the daily routine prescribed by the *Agni Purāṇa* with the *Nītiprakāśikā* shows that the latter does not provide for the king's consultation with spies. The *Agni Purāṇa* recommends physical exercise by the king after the disposal of business at the royal court and in the law-court. A similar provision is laid down for king Chandrāpīḍa in the *Kādambarī* by Bāṇa.[234] Further, our *Purāṇa* follows the *arthaśāstra smṛti*[235] tradition, unlike the *Nītiprakāśikā*, and advises the king to review his army, armoury, stores, etc. But it does not emphasize consultation with the commander-in-chief as we find in the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* and the *Daśakumāracharita*. It denotes the weakening of the military duties of the king, which, according to our *Purāṇa*, devolves upon high officers and feudatories.[236]

---

[234] *Kādambarī*, *Pūrvabhāga*, para 97, pp. 215-217.
[235] *Agni*, 235.16; cf. *Arth.*, 1.19; *Manu*, 7.222; *Yāj.*, 1.329; *VDP*, II. 151.37.

8

The daily time-table of the king, as given in our *Purāṇa*, is based on the *arthaśāstra-smṛti* tradition. But the king is not so overburdened in our period. He is asked to rise two *muhūrtas* before dawn-break, while in other works, he is asked to rise in the *brāhma-muhūrta*.[237] According to the *Parāśara-Mādhavīya*[238] there are two *muhūrtas* in the last part of the night before sunrise, the first of the two is called *brāhma* and the second *raudra*. Pitāmaha quoted in the *Smṛtichandrikā* states that the last part of the night is called *brāhma-muhūrta*. Since one *muhūrta* is equal to forty-eight minutes we find that the king is advised to arise only ninty-six minutes (nearly one and half hour) before sunrise.[239] But Kauṭilya expects the king to arise at 3 A.M. This indicates less work for kings in our period. In our text the study of the scriptures finds place only during day time and not at night as prescribed by Kauṭilya. Perhaps during this period brāhmaṇas' interpretation became more important than the king's own study, which may have helped the growth of the priestly prestige and power.

Thus the daily routine of the king in our *Purāṇa* shows some decline in royal authority. However, the king was expected to be the executive, judicial and military head of the state as well as the chief person to interpret the law with the help of the brāhmaṇas. His duties and responsibilities are many and exacting, and so he is charged with incessant work (*ajasra karma*) in his daily time-table. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* calls the chapter on the daily time-table of the king *ājasrika*; on the other hand our *Purāṇa* calls it *prātyāhika karma*, daily routine.

Duties and Functions of the King:

The king is the root of the seven limbs of the state,[240] and so he is required to perform many duties. In the very beginning of the chapters on polity, our *Purāṇa*[241] describes the essential duties of the king. It states that a king becomes the destroyer of the enemies, the protector of his subjects, and the wielder of the sceptre of justice. He takes a vow to protect all those who follow the path of virtue.

---

[236] *Agni*, 236.63, 241.20.

[237] According to the *Brahma Purāṇa* two *nāḍikās* are equal to one *muhūrta*, *naḍikābhyāmatha dvābhyāṁ muhūrto dvijasattamāḥ*. The *Sūryasiddhānta* (*Madhyamādhikāra*, v. 12): *nāḍiṣaṣṭyātu nakṣatrāmahorātram prakīrtitam.*

[238] As quoted in *HDS*, Vol. II part I, pp. 646-647.

[239] M. N. Dutt, (*Eng. Tr.* p. 839) translates *muhūrta* to mean only twenty-four minutes which is wrong.

[240] *Agni*, 225.12.

The compiler of our text seems to suggest that the king should consolidate his hold over the throne before embarking on any project. He lays down that the king, after being annointed, should subdue his enemies with the help of his high officers.[242] This probably refers to the problem of disposing of different claimants and their supporters or of launching a programme of conquest. Whenever there was a question of succession, the relatives divided themselves into rival camps supporting rival heirs. Struggles for the throne became more frequent with the downfall of the Guptas and the rise of small feudal principalities. After the death of the Chaulukya king Siddharāja, we find a successful manoeuvring by his minister, army generals and relatives to crown Kumārapāla in A.D. 1144, but a *coup d'e tat* swept him away from power and led to the accession of Ajayapāla (A.D. 1174), who subdued the friends and supporters of Kumārapāla in the same way as Kumārapāla had got rid of those who had opposed his accession.[243] The way in which Ajayapāla crushed his opponents, though inflated, is known from the *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga. Such a practice might have temporarily strengthened the king's hold on the throne but was bound to enhance the power and position of the ministers, army commanders, feudatories and relatives, who helped the winning candidate and thus weakened the kingdom. Thus we can appreciate the above dictum of the *Agni Purāṇa* regarding winning over the enemies in the light of the problem of succession in early medieval times.

There are many examples of enterprising monarchs, who set out for conquest after coronation. Bāṇa informs us that after his being annointed Chandrāpīḍa went out for universal victory,[244] similarly Harṣa, after becoming king, made up his mind for the conquest of the four quarters. He sent a message through his minister to all the kings of India asking them either to accept his paramountcy or to fight with him. After a few days Harṣa went out for conquest.[245] Epigraphic evidence shows that Mihira Bhoja[246] (c. A. D. 835-888) brought Kāliñjara under his control shortly after his accession. Our text[247] advises the king to subdue his own personal weaknesses before launching on a policy of conquest. It instructs the king to win over the allegiance of his servants (including the officers) and the people living in towns and villages. It should be the prerequisite of the conquest over his three types of enemies—hereditary, dynastic (*kulyānantara*) and artificial (*kṛtrima*).[248] Thus the compiler of our *Purāṇa* gives practical suggestion to the king to subdue his passions ; internal dissensions and disloyalty of his officers[249] and his subjects, and of external enemies. The king is, therefore, to win the heart of his subordinates and his people through his personal character and crush those who seem to be rebellious. Without the loyalty of his people and officers, it is not possible for any ruler to meet his enemies effectively. We find a similar advice tendered to the crown prince Naravāhanadatta regarding the duty of the king in the *Kathāsaritasāgara*.[250] Probably the officers and ministers, in our period, were either enticed with various rewards—money as well land, or murdered. The practice of giving land to the officers led to the rise of feudal lords.

---

[241] *Ibid.*, 218.2-3: *rājā bhavechchhatruhantā prajāpālaḥ su(su)daṇḍavān. pālayiṣyāmi vaḥ sarvāndharmasthānvratamācharet.*

[242] *Ibid.*, 220.1: *so'bhiṣīktaḥ sahāmātyo jayechchhatrūnnṛpottamaḥ.*

[243] *Gūrjara Deśa.*, Vol. II. pp. 336-337 and 356-357.

[244] *Kādambarī*, p. 237: *abhiṣekānantaraṁ cha prārabdha digvijayaḥ.*

[245] *Harṣacharita: eka Sāṁskṛtika Adhyayana*, p. 125.

Besides making stray references to the duties of the king. our *Purāṇa* provides three important lists of them. The first list indicates the influence of early *Smṛti-Purāṇa* literature.[251] The second and the third[252] lists of the king's duties belong to the *arthaśāstra* tradition—an abridgment of Kāmandaka's verses. It would be more convenient for us to discuss the duties of the king under four broader heads, destruction of the enemies, protection of the people, chastisement of the wicked and providing sustenance to the virtuous.

---

[246] *EI*, XIX, p. 17. Barah Copper Plate of A. D. 836.

[247] *Agni*, 225.8-9.

[248] *Ibid.*, 225.8-9: *tato bhṛtyajayaṁ kṛtvā paurajānapadam jayet,*
javedbāhyānarinpaśchādbāhyāścha trividhārayaḥ.

[249] Kumārapāla (1144-1174) extirpated the conspirators, despatched hostile ministers to the abode of Yama and got the impertinence of Kṛṣṇadeva, the king maker, checked with the aid of a few wrestlers, who broke his bones and blinded him. (*Gūrjara Deśa*., Vol. II, pp. 340-341).

[250] VI. 8.191-192: *kāmakrodhādikāṁ jitvā ripunābhyāntarāṁśchatān,*
jayedātmānamevādau vijayāyānvavidviṣām. etc.,

[251] *Agni*, 225.24-26 ; cf. *VDP*, II. 65.53-55 and 57 ; *Matsya*, 214. 60-61 ; *Śānti*., 86.23 and *Manu*, 7.88.

[252] *Ibid*., 238.2 and 239.44-45 ; cf. *KNS*, 2.18-19 and 5.77-78.

The people and the state can be nourished when there is no danger of aggression from outside and revolt from within. It is laid down by our *Purāṇa*[253] that the territory (*rāṣṭra*) is the best of all the seven limbs of the state, and that the king should protect and nourish it with all possible means. It also repeats the view of Kāmandaka that the seven limbs of the state are interdependent.[254] In order to ensure smooth and proper functioning the king is to protect the state and the fundamental unity of its seven limbs. He is asked to destroy him who hampers the smooth working of an element or revolts against it.[255] The punishment prescribed by our text in such a case is more deterrent than that of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Matsya Purāṇa*, which prescribe exile from the kingdom or imprisonment.[256] The *Agni Purāṇa* prescribes immediate death punishment for those who are dangerous to the state. In the event of a revolt by the people, it advises the king to put it down and enlist the help of town people during bad days, but before resorting to these measures he should take to diplomacy.[257]

Our *Purāṇa* describes the seven expedients of state policy and declares that the state is exposed to two types of defections (*kopa*), external and internal. The revolt of the feudatories is regarded as external, and those of the ministers, high officers, the princes, etc. as internal. Our text abridges the verses of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and leaves out the queen, crown prince, commander-in-chief, brāhmaṇas and the sons of the ministers from the list. The compiler omits them not because they are unimportant but probably they make the list long. The king is advised to pacify internal anger before marching against his enemies.[258] For gaining victory over his adversaries in war he is asked to follow the policy of twelve-state circle,[259] six-fold policy,[260] the advice of his astrologer,[261] and the seven expedients,[262] etc. He is to command the army in the battlefield. His chief duty in the field is to be firm.[263] Above all, the danger to the state is the five-fold

[253] *Ibid.*, 239.2 *rājyāṅgānāṁ varaṁ rāṣṭraṁ sādhanaṁ pālayetsadā*; 225.12: . . . *rakṣyastasmādrājyaṁ viśeṣṭaḥ*; 233.47; *KNS*, 6.3; *VDP*, II. 65.22.

[254] *Ibid.*, 239.1 ; cf. *KNS*, 4.1-2.

[255] *Ibid.*, 225.11-12 and 233,12-13: *saptāṅgasya tu rājyasyavighnakartṝnvināśayet.*

[256] *VDP*, II. 145..3-4.

[257] *Agni*, 241.16: *utthāpitena nītyā cha mānuṣaṁ vyasanaṁ haret*; 241. 19-20.

[258] *Ibid.*, 226.11 ; *VDP*, II. 68.7-12.

[259] *Ibid.*, 227.13-26.

[260] *Ibid.*, 228.16-25.

[261] *Ibid.*, 235.12.

[262] *Ibid.*, 228.1-16.

[263] *Ibid.*, 225.24: *saṁgrāmeṣvanivartitvaṁ.*

divine calamities, fire, flood, epidemics, famine and pestilence.[264] The king is exhorted to propitiate planets and gods through offering oblations to them.[265] Thus protection of the state against internal and external enemies is an important duty of the king.

Another important duty of the king is to protect the people, who are to be nourished like son.[266] Our *Purāṇa* holds that the sacrifice and penance of a king is meaningless if his subjects are unprotected. It further states that the palace of a king whose people are well-protected is like a heaven and the temple of a king whose subjects are not protected is a hell.[267] This is the traditional view of the king's duty, Kauṭilya[268] similarly lays down that for a king the religious vow is his readiness for action ; satisfactory discharge of people's work is his sacrifice, and impartiality in his treatment of all is equal to the fees, etc , spent in consecration. Somadeva Sūri[269] puts it more clearly that the protection of his subjects is the king's sacrifice, and he is not a king who does not protect his people. Our text declares that it is but for the protection offered by him that the king receives one-sixth of the income of his subjects—good or bad. He earns virtue through offering protection to them and commits sin by neglecting it.[270] So the greatest aim of the king, according to our *Purāṇa*, is to sacrifice his own interest for that of his people just as a pregnant woman cares little for herself but for her embryo. We find a similar verse in the *Nītiprakāśikā*.[271] However, this seems to be all based on Kauṭilya,[272] who attaches much importance to the welfare of the people and calls upon the king to indentify his welfare with that of the people, and his happiness with that of them, because the king's prosperity lies in it and not in things which are agreeable to him. Herein lies the idea of a welfare state.

---

[264] *Ibid.*, 241.14-15.

[265] *Ibid.*, chapts. 164, 263-267, etc.

[266] *Ibid.*. 225.24: *prajānām paripālanam*, 223.32: *rakṣechcha sarvatastvenaṁ pitā putramivaurasam.*

[267] *Ibid.*, 223.9-10: *kiṁ yajñestapasā tasya prajā yasya na rakṣitaḥ,*
surakṣitaḥ prajā yasya svargastasya gṛhopamaḥ,
arakṣitaḥ prajā yasya narakaṁ tasya mandiraṁ; cf. *VDP*, II. 61.24-25.

[268] *Arth.*, 1.19.

[269] *NVA*, 7.21: *sa kiṁ rājā yo na rakṣati prajāḥ*, 26.66: *prajāpālanaṃ hi rajño yajñaḥ.*

[270] *Agni*, 22310-11: *rājā ṣaḍbhāgamādatte sukṛtādduṣkṛtādapi,*
dharmāgamo rakṣaṇāchcha pāpamāpnotyarakṣaṇāt ;
cf. Handiqui, *op. cit.*, p. 99.
yathaiva puṇyasya sukarmabhājāṁ ṣaṣthāṃśabhāgī nṛpatiḥ suvṛttaḥ,
tathaiva pāpasya kukarmabhājāṁ ṣaṣthāṃśabhāgī nṛpatiḥ kuvṛttaḥ.

[271] 8.2.

[272] *Arth.*, 1.19.

We are again given some idea of the dangers against which protection is to be provided. Our *Purāṇa* lays down that the people should be protected against five dangers, soldiers, thieves, officers of the king, king's favourites and the ruler's greed. Herein, we find a slight deviation from Kāmandaka, whose *āyuktaka* (officers) are replaced in the *Agni Purāṇa* by *āmuktika* (soldiers),[273] which strengthens our belief in the growing importance of soldiers in our period The other such list,[274] provided by our own text, is a little different though it also enumerates five dangers. The new elements are—*subhagāḥ*, *viṭ* and the *kāyasthas*. The number of the dangers are five in *Yājñavalkya*, eleven or twelve in the *Nītivākyāmṛta* and nine in the *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi*. The last two texts call them the thorns of the state, which must be weeded out by the king. According to the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti*[275] the people need protection against soldiers (*chāṭa*), thieves (*taskara*), bad characters (*durvṛtta*), renowned criminals (*mahāsāhasika*), and especially against the *kāyasthas*. Somadeva Sūri[276] states that thieves, exiled kṣatriyas (*charaṭa*), those who use weights and measures (*mannapa*), those who fix the price of commodities (*dhaman*), royal favourites, foresters (*āṭavika*), frontier guards (*talāra*), officers in charge of gambling, officers of the state, headmen of villages (*grāmakūṭa*), hoarders of grain (*vārddhuṣikā*) are thorns to the state. Someśvaradeva[277] enjoins the king to protect the people against thieves, respectable persons (*mānyaka*), officers in charge of financial matter (*arthādhikārī*), criminals, rich persons (*āḍhya*), wicked (*durāchārī*), enemies, and especially against the *kāyasthas*.

It will be interesting to discuss the meaning of these terms. Mitramiśra quotes the verses from the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and explains the term

[273] 239.46: *āmuktikebhyaḥ chaurebhyaḥ paurebhyo rājaballabhāt,*
pṛthivīpatilobhāchcha prajānāṁ pañchadhā bhayam ;
cf. *KNS*, 5.82 (Here the term *parebhyo* seems to be a case of miscopying, but taking at its literal meaning it means 'enemy').

[274] 223.11-12 ; cf. *VDP*, II. 61.28-29, It adds *chāṭaḥ*.

[275] *Yāj.*, 1.336 also quoted by the *Rājanītiprakāśa*, p. 253.

[276] *NVA*, 8.21. The meaning of the terms is according to the commentary by an unknown writer given with the text (Maṇikachanda Digambar Jain Series. One of the MSS includes merchants (*kirāta*) in this list.

[277] *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.157-158.

subhagā as favourite wife or even a harlot[278]. But it seems improbable that the queen tyrannised her subjects because, in our period or in the period before, women possessed practically no say in the political or administrative affairs. The harlots were despised in society. So the term seems to be the plural form of the term *subhaga* rather than its feminine derivative.[279] The term probably seems to mean man of distinction and fortune, and may be compared to the *mānyaka* of Someśvaradeva. Men of distinction may either belong to the grade of high officers or to the rich class of society. Alberuni informs us how Kallar, the Vazir of Lagaturman, grew in power and influence, when he found hidden treasures by accident.[280] We know much of the cruel deeds of the feudal nobles in medieval India and of the landlords in modern times. Growing disparity in wealth, however, was criticised in our period. Somadeva Sūri[281] hates the appropriation of wealth for self and hints at an equal distribution of it. Our own text has a pathetic simile for the poor, who is no better than a degraded person in society.[282] Murārimiśra calls the Mt. Mandarāchala wicked because it brought forth sinful Lakṣmī (wealth) which created difference between rich and poor—a difference which permeates the whole world.[283] To make the statement more impressive Murārimiśra puts these words across to Sītā through Rāmachandra, an incarnation of Viṣṇu.

At one place our *Purāṇa* considers the *pauras* to be a danger to the people, and at another the helpers of the king during bad days.[284] *Pauras* probably stand here for officers-in-charge of the town. They may be helpful to the king, but there is no doubt that they constitute a danger to the public weal when they misuse their power and grow haughty.[285]

---

[278] *Rājanītiprakāśa*, p. 256, *subhagā, atipriyā strī, veśyā vā.*

[279] Queen or harlot may easily be included in the list of the king's favourites.

[280] *Alberuni's India*, Vol. II, p. 13.

[281] *NVA*, 1.15: *arthiṣu saṁvibhāgaḥ svayamupabhogaśchārthasya hi dve phale, nāstyauchityamekāntalubdhasya.*

[282] *Agni*, 223.5-7.

[283] *Anargharāghava*, 7.41: *etenaiva durātmnā jalanidherutthāpya pāpāmimāṁ lakṣmīmīśvaradurgatavyavahṛtivyastaṁ jagannirmitam.*

[284] *Agni*, 241.20: *paurādyāśchopakurvanti saṁśrayādiḥ durdinam.*

[285] Mookerji, R. K., *Aśoka*, 1955, pp. 121-22. In his Kaliṅga Rock Edict I Aśoka asks the city magistrates (*nagarvyavahārika*) to 'strive all the time that there may not be imprisonment of the citizens or their torture without cause.' He instituted the practice of inspection, to see whether his orders were carried out by them or not. Misgovernance on their part caused revolt in Taxilā.

That the soldiers were regarded as a source of danger to the people, according to the *Agni Purāṇa*, is supported by some contemporary texts. Somadeva Sūri[286] refers to the recruitment of soldiers from other kingdoms because of their specialisation in a particular type of battle. Probably they may be recruited as mercenaries, and naturally have no attachment to the soil and the people they serve. Their chief aim is to get their salary and booty in the war. They have no scruples in plundering the people and outraging them when the central government becomes weak. Furthermore, we find constant wars waged for succession, defence, and expansion, which was bound to weaken the state. In such a condition regular payment of salary was improbable, and possibly soldiers maintained themselves by loot and rapine. The king alone could protect the people against their outrages. Yājñavalkya and the *Viṣṇudharmottara*[287] also include *chāṭa* (the soldiers) in the list of dangers, but in his gloss on the passage of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* Mitramiśra[288] wrongly takes the *chāṭaḥ* as demagogues (*bahubhāṣinaḥ*). The *Mitākṣarā*[289] explains them as 'persons, who deprive people of their wealth after producing false confidence in them.' We find kings granting *achāṭabhaṭapraveśya* villages and lands to the brāhmaṇas in and after the Gupta period. The villages and the land were to be entered by the regular and irregular troops (*chāṭas* and *bhaṭas*) only for capturing robbers and rebels.[290] The Valabhī grant of Dhārasen II[291] (A.D. 571-572), his Palitana. Plate of the same year[292] and the Banskhera Plate of Harṣa[293] mention the *chāṭas* and the *bhaṭas* along with royal servants. So there is no doubt that the *chāṭas* are irregular soldiers entrusted with police duties. The fact that they were not allowed to enter the lands and villages granted by the king shows that the kings feared their oppressive activities. The commentator Aparārka[294] quotes Bṛhaspati, who considers *chāṭas* and thieves to be the enemies of the people. The disintegration of the great Gupta empire and the rise of small feudal principalities probably gave rise to mercenary soldiers on a large scale, a development reflected in post-Gupta texts.[295]

---

[286] *Yaśastilakachampūmahākāvya*, Banaras, 1960, pp. 310-313.

[287] *Yāj.*, 1.336 ; *VDP*, II. 61.28-29

[288] *Rājanītiprakāśa*, p. 256.

[289] *Mitākṣarā* on Yāj., 1.336.

[290] *EI*, XI, p. 221, Surat Plate of Maitraka Vyāghrasena ; *EI*, VIII, p. 287, Betual Plates of Saṅkṣobha: *achāṭabhaṭapraveśyam choradrohakavarjam ; CII*, III, No, 21-22 Khoh Copper Plates of Mahārāja Hastin, No. 23—Majhagāwāṁ Copper Plate of Mahārāja Hastin (A. D. 510-511) ; cf. No. 27—Khoh grant of Mahārāja Jayanātha (A. D. 496-497), line 14, etc.

[291] *IA*, XV, p. 187.

[292] *EI*, XI, p.83.

[293] *EI*, IV, p.211. For details see *HDS*, Vol. III, pp.983-984.

[294] *Aparārka* on *Yāj.*, 1.336.

The term *viṭ* is generally translated as swindlers or robbers.[296] But we find that the compiler of our *Purāṇa*[297] uses the term to mean vaiśya caste. The chapters containing synonyms for the four castes are given the title '*nṛbrahmakṣatra viṭśūdravargāḥ* and '*kṣatraviṭśūdravargāḥ*'. Thus he seems to instruct the king to protect his people against the tyranny of vaiśyas, traders and merchants. The vaiśyas carried on trade, agriculture, and lent money on interest.[298] It is just probable that during our period they extorted money from the common masses by unduly raising the price of commodities, by using false weights and measures, and by charging high interest. On the other hand they might have defrauded the government of the taxes through illicit trade. Our view is supported by the contemporary literature. Somadeva Sūri, while enumerating the thorns of the state, brackets persons using false weights and measures, hoarders of grain and those who fix the price of commodities with the merchants (*kirāta*)[299] and the forest guards. He further states that the merchants are like thieves who rob the people, in their very presence, and exploit them by resorting to false weights and balance, and adulteration. They raise the price of a thing through competition.[300] He further states that if the unjust methods are not taken into account by the king, everything is destroyed.[301] The *Kathāsaritasāgara* refers to a caravan of merchants, which prefers a hilly and desolate path to a public road to avoid high customs duties.[302] It shows how things were smuggled during our period. Since forest was infested with robbers, they would have taken the help of the forest officers. The forest officers, either by their inefficiency or in collusion with the merchants, are unable to apprehend them. On account of it the forest officers are held to be a thorn to the state. This leads us to the conclusion that the king is expected to regulate weights and measures, price, and distribution of things on the one hand, and to check tax-evasion and to punish those who break his regulations on the other.

---

[295] *CII*, IV, Part I, p. 143. Mirashi identifies the *chāṭas* and the *bhaṭas* mentioned in early land grants as policemen and soldiers deputed to maintain peace and order, and to apprehend criminals. But as they were, often harsh and exacting in their behaviour, they were restricted from entering villages granted to the brāhmaṇas.

[296] Dutt, M. N., *Eng. Tr.* Vol. II, p. 797.

[297] 152.1: *kṣatraviṭśūdradharmeṇa jīvanneva tu śūdrajāt;*
157.3: *kṣatraviṭ śūdrayoniṣu;* 364.1; chapts.364 and 366.

[298] *Ibid.*, 366.23-24.

[299] *NVA* (Grantharatnamālā Series Bombay, 1890.), p. 20, commentary thereon derives the word '*kirāta*' as *kīryante dhanāni yebhiḥ te kirātāḥ.*

[300] *Ibid.*, 8.14: *vaṇigjanakṛto'rthaḥ sthitānāgantukāṁścha pīḍayati,*
8.17-19: *na vaṇigbhyaḥ santi pare paśyato harāḥ,* etc.

[301] *Ibid.*, 8.20: *anyāyopekṣā sarvaṁ vināśyati.*

[302] *Kathās.*, VI. 3.105: *vayau cha sa vaṇiksārthaḥ puraskṛtyāṭavipatham,*
bahuśulkabhayātyaktamārgāntarajanāśritam,

Kāyasthas[303] are regarded as a great danger by the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti*, the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi*; our *Purāṇa* reproduces its views on *kāyasthas* from the first two. The *kāyasthas* did not constitute a separate sub-caste in the period of the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti*, but developed as such in the 12th century A. D. They seem to have been scribes, who made alterations, omissions and additions even in the royal writs, which might have changed their very spirit and thus harmed the people. Our *Purāṇā*[304] prescribes the highest amercement for this crime. The *Rājataraṅgiṇī*[305] describes the tyranny of the *kāyasthas* in Kāśmīra, where they appear as royal officers for the brāhmaṇa Śivaratha is described as a roguish *kāyastha*.[306] The *Mitākṣarā*[307] states that the *kāyasthas* are accountants and scribes, and favourites of the king who are very cunning.

The efficiency of every government lies in making the life and property of its subjects secure. Our *Purāṇa* directs the king to protect the people against thieves and robbers, and lays down that the king shall restore the value of an article stolen by a thief to the real owner, if the thief is not caught, and deduct the amount from the salary of the police-officer.[308] Our text praises the rule of Kārtavīrya Arjuna, whose name struck terror into the heart of thieves and robbers and during whose rule a thing left on the road was as safe as in a house.[309]

---

[303] *Yāj.*, 1.336-37; cf. *Agni*, 223.12; *VDP*, II. 65.29; *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.258: *viśeṣeṇa cha kāyasthaiḥ piḍitaḥ pālayetprajāḥ*. M. N. Dutt wrongly translates the tern 'kāyastha' as usurers. (*Eng. Tr.*, Vol.II, p. 798).

[304] 227.63-64: *ūnaṁ vā'pyadhikaṃ vā'pi likhedyo rājaśāsanaṃ daṇḍa uttamaḥ.*

[305] 5.180-84 and 8.23, 83; cf. Viṣṇu, 7.3; *Yāj.*, 1.336; Mṛchchha., Act 9. They are termed as *śūdra* in *Vedavyāsa Smṛti* 1.10-11.

[306] *Ibid.*, 8.2383.

[307] On *Yāj.*, 1.336.

[308] *Agni*, 223.21.

[309] *Ibid.*, 275.7: *anaṣṭadravyatā rāṣṭre tasya saṁsmaraṇādabhūt.*

According to our *Purāṇa* protection means not only safety against internal and external enemies but also maintenance of brāhmaṇas, ascetics, the helpless, the destitute, the aged, widows and truthful women and cows. Maintenance of brāhmaṇas, cows and truthful wives of the people is considered to be an act of merit on account of the close relationship of state and religion. Brāhmaṇas are to be honoured like god and protected like son. Their help is said to be essential for the stability of the kingdom. Brāhmaṇas are respected and given an honoured position, because they represent the king as divine and thus persuade the people to offer their loyalty and support to him. Moreover, they are repositories of learning and culture during our period. The king is required to ascertain the attainments, occupations of the brāhmaṇas and then to provide them with suitable means of livelihood.[310] He is to make lavish gifts to them.[311] It is interesting to note that on the one hand the compiler of our text extends paternal care of the king to the brāhmaṇas ; on the other he exalts them to a position even superior to the god and states that the king should always show due honour to the brāhmaṇas; because they are illustrious and capable enough of making or unmaking even a god. The first expression is borrowed from the *Manu Smṛti*, which was compiled during the Śuṅga rule when the king extended to the brāhmaṇas and brāhmaṇism paternal support against Buddhism. Under the patronage of the successive rulers of the Śuṅga, Kāṇva, Āndhra, Nāga-Vākāṭaka and Gupta kings the brāhmaṇas and their faith grew dominant in society. In the Gupta period they became powerful and began to claim supernatural power as makers of gods.[312] Our *Purāṇa* lays down that the merits of religious worship offered every day by the brāhmaṇas, protected by the king, prolong the life of the king and increase the prosperity of the kingdom.[313] Failure to protect the brāhmaṇas is said to bring famine, epidemics and growth of thieves and robbers.[314] The cry of a brāhmaṇa wife destroys the royal dynasty, the king and the people.[315]

---

[310] *Ibid.*, 223.31-32.

[311] *Ibid.*, 225.23.

[312] *VDP*, II. 32.14: *Agni*, 222.17-18 ; cf. *Yama* quoted by the *Rājadharmakāṇḍa* of *Kṛtyakalpataru*, p. 172: *brāhmaṇān pūjayennityaṁ prātarutthāya bhūpatiḥ, brāhmaṇānāṁ prasāden vasanti divi devatā.*

[313] *Agni*, 223.32-33 quotes the verse *verbatim* from the *Manu Smṛti*, 7.136, same verse is found in the *VDP*, II. 61.67.

[314] *Ibid*, 223.30-31 ; *Manu*, 7.134 ; *VDP*, II. 61.65.

[315] *Ibid.*, 222.18 ; *VDP*, II, 32.17: *brāhmaṇi rudati hanti kulaṁ rājyaṃ prajāsthaḥ.*

Cow is venerated by the Hindus from very early times. Our *Purāṇa* follows the old *smṛti* tradition and ordains that there is no merit higher than what is gained through laying one's life for the protection of brāhmaṇas and cows.[316] The king is held responsible for their protection.[317] The protection of cows is advised, perhaps due to their importance in agricultural economy. Our *Purāṇa* prescribes the amputation of the hands and feet of the person guilty of killing a cow, elephant, horse or a camel.[318] Elephants, horses and camels are protected because they are used in war.

Upholding of the *varṇāśramadharma* constitutes an important duty of the king both according to the *dharmaśāstra* and the *arthaśāstra* literature. Our *Purāṇa*[319] only repeats the old principle. According to Manu[320] the king was created to protect the laws of caste and stage. It is important to note that even Somadeva Sūri,[321] a Jain writer, accepts the vedic authority and calls upon the king to see that the *varṇāśrama* rules are observed by the people and no one transgresses the prescribed code of conduct. That kingdom is best, he states, where the *varṇāśramadharma* is observed by the people[322] and where there is no mixed caste.[323] It cannot be asserted that all the kings of ancient India preserved this *varṇāśramadharma*, but it was an idea which kings generally tried to follow. Some of the inscriptions refer to such kings. The Asirgarh Copper Seal Inscription of the Maukharī king Śarvavarman compares the king Śarvavarman with Viṣṇu for preserving the *varṇāśrama* system.[324] Alberuni testifies to the fact that the kings of India in his period endeavoured always to maintain the *varṇāśramadharma*.[325]

The king cannot protect the people and the kingdom unless he himself is well protected. Our *Purāṇa*[326] lays down that the king is the root of the state, and so he should be protected first. Somadeva Sūri[327] states that if the king is protected, everything is protected and so the king is to be always protected against his own people and the enemies. He is advised, further, not to be careless about his own protection.[328] The duties of the king are considered to be exacting.[329] The king cannot perform them unless he is mentally and physically fit for hard work. Besides, he is to be well versed in the art of warfare so that he may protect his body from his adversaries. The king is advised by our text[330] to appoint body-guards and spies for himself, to consult his physicians and the astrologers regarding appropriate medicine and auspicious time as well as the ways of warding off planetary evils. He is further urged to take daily physical exercise and practise the handling of arms and weapons, etc.[331] But the idea of protecting the king is developed to further limits by our *Purāṇa*.[332] It states that everything is destroyed with the destruction of the root, and so the king should not engage himself in actual fighting in the battlefield ; he should be two miles away from the fighting line. It seems that the compiler of our *Purāṇa* thinks that everything becomes disorganised with the death of the king. He seems to hold the queen, the prince and the ministers in great distrust. The king is advised neither to sleep in female apartment at night nor to repose trust in queens, especially those who possess sons ;[333] he should visit only such queens as are well-disposed towards him and discard those who are not loyal to him.[334] Other writers on polity[335] similarly deprecate the idea of putting too much faith in women and illustrate it with past examples. Somadeva Sūri[336] compares women with the tide of ocean, the abode of both nectar and poison. He advises the king against antagonising the queen. He is so distrustful of women that he asks the king neither to appoint any women to look after things used by him nor to partake of anything sent from his wife's apartment.[337] Our *Purāṇa*[338] lays down that the king should be ever suspicious like a crow and should use only such food, drink, bed, etc., as are examined first by other trusted persons. The king is asked to store medicines and gems which counteract poison, and to take the help of animals and birds which detect it.

---

[316] *Ibid.*, 173.7.

[317] *Ibid.*, 292.1: *goviprapālanaṁ kāryaṁ rājñā ...*

[318] *Ibid.*, 227.32: *ardhapādakaraḥ kārya gogajāśvoṣṭraghātakāḥ.*

[319] *Ibid.*, 225.26: *varṇāśrama vyavasthānaṁ.*

[320] 7.35: *varṇānāmāśramāṇāṁ cha rājā sṛṣṭo hi rakṣitā.*

[321] *NVA*, 7.2: *trayītaḥ khalu varṇāśramāṇāṁ dharmādharmavyavasthā.*

[322] *Ibid.*, 5.5: *varṇāśramavatī dhānyāhiraṇyapaśukupyavṛṣṭipradānaphalā cha pṛthvī.*

[323] *Ibid.*, 26.55. sa *deśo'nusartavyo yatra nāsti varṇaśaṁkarah.*

[324] *CII*, III. No. 47: *chatussamudrātikrānta kīrtiḥpratāpānurāgopanatānya rājā varṇāśrama vyavasthāpana pravṛtt chakras chakradhara iva prajānāmattiharaḥ. . .*

[325] *Alberuni's India*, Vol. I, p.99.

[326] 225.12: *mūlaṁ svāmī sa vai rakṣyaḥ. . .*

---

[327] *NVA*, 24.1: *rājñi rakṣite sarvaṁ rakṣitaṁ bnavatyataḥ svebhyaḥ parebhyaścha nityaṁ rajā rakṣitavyaḥ.*

[328] *Ibid.*, 25.72: *ātmarakṣāyāṁ kadāchidapi na pramādayet.*

[329] 235.1: *ajasra karma . . .*

[330] 220.4, 220.20, 235.7, 235.12: *sāṁvatsarāṇāṁ vaidyānāṁ mantriṇāṁ vachane rataḥ, rājā vibhūtimāpnoti . . .*

[331] *Ibid.*, 235.13.

[332] *Ibid.*, 236.33: *mulāchchhede vināśaḥ syānna yudhyechcha svyaṁ nṛpaḥ, sainyasya paśchāttiṣṭhettu krośamātre mahīpatiḥ* ; cf. *VDP*, II. 177.23-24.

[333] *Ibid* , 224.42 ; cf. *NVA*, 24.31 ; *durdurasya sarpagṛhaprāveśa iva strīgṛhapraveśo 'rājñaḥ.*

[334] *Ibid.*, 224.10.

[335] *KNS*, 7.49-54 ; *NVA*, 24.35-36.

[336] *NVA*, 24.10.

The king is to be protected against the princes also. But the prince is not distrusted so much as in the *Arthaśāstra*. Bharadvāja[339] compares the prince with a crab which eats away its own progenitor. Kauṭilya and Somadeva Sūri compare the royal family containing a disaffected prince with a worm-eaten piece of wood which crumbles down soon.[340] In the *Kathāṣaritsāgara*[341] princes are compared with the *paiśāchas* who are difficult to be controlled. Furthermore, they are likened to a rutting elephant, who, without caring for his good, kills his driver. Somadeva Bhaṭṭa[342] ridicules the love of the king for his sons, who like monkey eat away their begetter. The king is instructed by our text to protect the prince against those who are greedy, angry, and are dishonoured by him, and to get him trained in the various branches of learning which foster humility. Those who are worthless should be tied down with pleasures.[343] Our *Purāṇa* does not advocate any harsh punishment for the disobeying prince. Such a punishment prescribed by the *Arthaśāstra* seems to have been extenuated by the *smṛti* tradition.

In spite of all the distrust of the queen shown in our text and other contemporary literature our *Purāṇa* enjoins the king to always protect the queen. *Kāma* is one of the three-fold aims of life. The king is counselled to study the science of erotics, perhaps to win the love of his queen[344] and to collect gems and precious stones, for sexual enjoyment is the primary concern of women.[345] Our *Purāṇa*[346] states that the king has to protect his harem because queens are necessary for religious purposes and for gaining prowess and energy. On the other hand Somadeva Sūri[347] holds that the queen has to be protected to maintain the purity of the royal blood and to ward off unfortunate events ; they are not meant for his sexual enjoyment.

---

[337] *Ibid.*, 24.32-33.

[338] 225.30-31 ; 222.7-9 ; *VDP*, II. 64-67

[339] *Arth.*, 1.17.

[340] *Ibid.*, 1.17 ; *NVA*, 24.72: *ghuṇajagdhaṁ kāṣṭhamivāvinītaṃ rājaputraṃ rājakulamabhiyuktamātraṁ bhajyet.*

[341] VI. 2.152 and 2.155: *ete paiśācha na tvete rājaputrā matāḥ sakhi.*

[342] *Ibid.*, VI. 2.48: *rājyalubdheṣu kā tesu putreṣvāsthā mahībhujām,*
ye bhakṣayanti janakaṁ bata markaṭakā iva.
But it seems that the copyist has miscopied *markaṭakā* for *karkaṭakā,* which is more correct and may be taken for the influence of Kauṭilya.

[343] *Agni*, 225.2-3.

[344] *Ibid.*, 224.1-2 and 225.1.

The king is enjoined to protect the prince, perhaps, to safeguard the smooth line of succession after the death of the king. It is interesting to note that Somadeva Sūri advises the king to protect first his wives, then his near relatives (*dāyāda*) and finally his sons as their attachment to the king is deeper in reverse order.[348]

The third broader duty of the king, according to our *Purāṇa*, is to dispense even-handed justice. It declares that the king by doing so gains seven virtues—piety, wealth, fame, maintenance of social orders, much respect among his subjects and a place in heaven after his death.[349] Furthermore, our text asks the king to refund thirty times the fine he imposes on an innocent person, to the brāhmaṇas, after dedicating the sum first to the god Varuṇa, the celestial dispenser of justice.[350] He is directed to make arrangements for adjudication of civil and criminal cases.

On the basis of Kauṭilya and Kāmandaka the *Agni Purāṇa* dwells upon the economic responsibility of the king. The king is required to earn wealth through just means, to increase it, to protect it and to spend it on righteous cause.[351] The relevant verse is placed at the beginning of the chapters on polity attributed first to Puṣkara and then repeated by Rāma to Lakṣmaṇa, which shows that the economic duties of the king are thought to be very important by the compiler of the *Agni Purāṇa*. He is further instructed to maintain and protect eight things—(i) agriculture, (ii) trade routes, (iii) forts, (iv) bridges

345 *Ibid.*, 224.3: *kāmādhīnāḥ striyo rāma tadarthaṁ ratnasaṁgrahaḥ.*

346 *Ibid.*, 224.1: *vakṣye'ntaḥ purachintāṁ cha dharmādyāḥ puruṣārthakāḥ....*

347 *NVA*, 24.27: *vaṁśaviśudhyarthamanarthaparihārārthaṃ striyo rakṣyānte na bhogārthaṁ.*

348 *Ibid.*, 24.7: *rājñastyadāsannā striya āsannatarā dāyādā āsannatamāścha putrāstato rājñaḥ prathamaṁ strībhyo rakṣṇaṃ tato dāyādebhyastataḥ putrebhyaḥ.*

349 *Agni*, 258.83: *... paśyato vyavahārāṁścha guṇaḥ syuḥ sapta bhūpateḥ.*

350 *Ibid.*, 258.82: *rājñā'nyāyena daṇḍogṛhīto varuṇāya tam,*
nivedya dadyādviprebhyoḥ svayaṁ triṃśadguṇikṛtam.

351 *Ibid.*, 238.2 same as *KNS*, 1.18, *nyāyenā'rājānamarthasya vardhanaṁ rakṣaṇam charet, satpātrapratipattiścha rājavṛttaṁ chaturvidham.*

and canals, (v) capturing of elephants, (vi) mines and minerals, (vii) import of soldiers, and (viii) building of towns in uninhabited region.[352] Therefore to supervise the agricultural and industrial economy of his kingdom and to make it financially prosperous was one of the chief duties of the king. The king is called the root of the state and treasury the root of monarchy.[353]

Two or three terms, used by our *Purāṇa* in the list of the royal economic duties, need our attention. The exact meaning of the term *kuñjarabandhana* is not clear.[354] Literally it means tieing an elephant. Our text[355] states that the king is to protect and maintain eight things including *kuñjarabandhana.* Kāmandaka[356] advises the king to increase them in a just manner. The same verse we find quoted by Sītārāma, a commentator on the *Nītiprakāśikā,* to explain the eight-fold duties of the king.[357] He explains the term *kuñjarabandhana* to mean that the king should take the help of villagers and the rich persons of the rural area to maintain the elephants as they eat much. It is not known whether the ownership of elephants remained a royal privilege as we find in the pre-Maurya and Maurya periods.[358]

However, Someśvardeva[359] (A.D. 1129-30) asks the king to protect the elephant forest, to put to death the man who kills an elephant and to personally go to forests with the officer in charge of capturing elephants (*mātaṅgabandhaka*) for capturing elephants. Our text[360] declares the elephants to be the beauty of the war-camp and the army, but the punishment it prescribes for killing an elephant is much less than what we find in the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi*, and this may indicate some decrease in the importance of elephants.

---

[352] *Ibid.,* 239.44-45; cf. *Arth.,* 7.1: *durgasetukarmavaṇikapathaśūnyvaniveśa-khanidravyahastivanakarmāṇi*; KNS, 5.78 Manu (7.154) recommends that the king should perform eight-fold duties (*aṣṭavidham karma*) but does not elaborate it. His commentator Medhātithi (as quoted by Kullūkabhaṭṭa, p. 261) explains the term *aṣṭavidham karma* to mean — to begin which is not begun, to complete which is begun, to refine what is done, to protect the outcome; besides he enumerates four expedients, treaty, gift, punishment and dissension.

[353] *Agni,* 241.22: *koṣa mūlo hi bhūpatiḥ*; *KNS,* 13.33: *koṣa mūlo hi rājeti*; *NVA,* 21.5 and 21.7.

[354] *Eng. Tr.,* p.858.

[355] 239.44-45.

[356] 5.79.

[357] *NP,* pp. 14-15: *kuñjarabandhanaṁ bahubhaksakatvātteṣāṃ yathāvibhāgaṃ grāmīṇadhanikaireva grāme grāme poṣanārtham bandhanaṁ.*

[358] *Ibid.,* 2.2; McCrindle, *Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arian,* p.90. All these sources are indebted to Kauṭilya, who uses this term for the first time and describes the method of capturing wild elephants. He provides for the appointment of a superintendent of elephants.

[359] Abhilaṣi., I. 2.172-73, 2.181: *ye kariṇaḥ pāpā ghātayettān mahīpatiḥ...* 2.182-221, I. 2.202: *saṅgato gajabandhārthaṁ gachchhedrājñā niyojitaḥ.*

Similarly the word *balādānam* in the text of the *Agni Purāṇa* consulted by us is not found in other works containing the relevant verse. The Trivandrum edition of the *Kāmandaka* contains *vanādānam*, its Bombay edition uses *dhanādānam*, and the commentary on the *Nīti-prakāśikā* reads it as *karādānam*. All these words taken separately may throw light on the various duties of the king. We do not find much difference between the levy of funds or forced loan (*dhanādānam*) and imposition of taxes (*karādānam*), which may mean different kinds of taxes. The Trivandrum edition of the *Kāmandaka Nītiśara* explains the term *vanādānam* in the same way as Kauṭilya,[361] who states that the forest is to be maintained and protected. The same view finds favour with Medhātithi[362] and Kullūkabhaṭṭa. The term *balādānam* according to our own text means that the king should enlist troops from other countries. Some of the kingdoms were famous for elephants, some for good horses, and some for warriors expert in the use of particular weapons. In the *Yaśastilaka* we find the king Yaśodhara reviewing his troops from Dramila (S. India), Uttarāpatha, the Gurjara land, Tirhut and Gauḍa ; they are experts in carrying litters, horsemanship, archery, naval warfare and the use of elephants, and bad discipline respectively.[363] Handiqui[364] believes that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa emperors possibly included in their armies regiments composed of soldiers of different nationalities in India. It is just possible that during the tri-partite struggle of the Pratihāras, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Pālas, soldiers ill-treated by one joined the service of another like mercenaries. The practice of recruiting soldiers from various parts of India began to be considered important during our period so that the mercenaries could be employed against the countries expert in that particular method of warfare. This accounts for the importance attached to the import or recruitment of mercenary soldiers by our text.

---

[360] 287.5: *kuñjarāḥ paramā śobhā śibirasya balasya cha ; VDP*, II. 48.1.

[361] *Arth.*, VII. 1.99 *vanakarmāṇi*.

[362] *Manu*, p.261: *dāruvanachchhedanaṁ*.

[363] *Yaśas.*, NSP, III. 4. p.461.

[364] Handiqui, K. K., *op. cit.* p.96.

Our *Purāṇa*[365] lays down that the king should provide livelihood to all like god Parjanya. He is further asked to look after the welfare of destitutes, infirm, old, widows and women in general and to provide them with subsistence.[366] The compiler of our text ordains that the king should maintain the relatives of his soldiers, killed in the battlefield. The *Viṣṇudharmottara*[367] restricts this provision only to the wives and other women who are issueless. Thus as regards social welfare our *Purāṇa* is more liberal than the *Viṣṇudharmottara.*

It would appear that the *Agni Purāṇa* lays down a comprehensive scheme of king's duties. He is a protector *par excellence*, protecting the state and its constituents including himself, the people and their rule of conduct as laid down in the scriptures, the queen, the prince, and his relatives against internal and external dangers. He is to regulate not only the price-policy of the kingdom, but to provide leadership to the people, liberal state-welfare programmes for the afflicted, poor, destitutes, etc.

The king is also required to maintain old temples and build new ones. He is advised to consecrate images of gods in the temple. He is counselled to offer worship to them and to make arrangements for music, dance and drama in the temple. Our text describes the resulting merit of the construction of various types of temples—clay, wood, brick and stone, and declares that the construction of even the smallest temple confers prosperity on the king in this life and heaven in the next. The king is advised not to use the property dedicated to gods, as it leads to hell ;[368] on the contrary he is exhorted to make lavish gifts and grants to them. It is interesting to find that one verse of our text,[369] borrowed from the *Viṣṇudharmottara* is quoted in many inscriptions granting land or villages to the temples or to the brāhmaṇas in our period. Out of the thirty-one grants of the Kalachuri Chedi Era two were made to Buddhist monasteries, three to Hindu temples and twenty-six to the brāhmaṇas.[370]

---

[365] *Agni,* 239.43.

[366] *Ibid.,* 225.25 ; *VDP,* II. 65.54 ; *Śānti.,* 86.23.

[367] *VDP,* II. 177.91.

[368] *Agni,* 222.11-16 ; 225.23.

[369] *Ibid.,* 222.15-16 : *suvarṇamekaṁ gāmekāṃ bhūmerapyekamaṅgulam, harannarakamāpnoti yāvadābhūtasaṁplavam* ; VDP, II.32.7.

[370] *CII,* IV, No.48 Banaras Plates of Karṇa of the year 793 (A. D. 1042), verse 37 ; No. 50 Goharwa Plates of Karṇa (A. D. 1047), v. 36 ; No. 63

Our text compares the king's duties with religious sacrifice.[371] It lays down that religious sacrifices and penance are useless for a king if his subjects are not well protected. A similar idea is found in other texts. Kauṭilya[372] likens readiness to discharge his people's work to sacrifice, and impartiality of treatment to the sacrificial fee paid to the brāhmaṇas. Somadeva Sūri[373] equates the protection of the people with the religious sacrifice. Varāhamihira[374] enumerates five important duties for the king, and declares them to be the five sacrifices prescribed for the king. These, according to him, are punishment of the wicked, honour to the gentle, replenishment of the treasury in a just way, impartiality in judgment and the protection of the kingdom. The same verse is repeated by the *Atri Smṛti*,[375] though without acknowledgement. The *Viṣṇudharmottara*[376] recommends five sacrifices for the king and holds them to be capable of expiating all his sins; a judicious performance of these five duties makes the king free from public criticism of his other weaknesses. Similarly, the *Bṛhaddharma Purāṇa*[377] considers the protection of his subjects by the king to be equal to one thousand horse-sacrifices, and adds that one who rules them according to the law earns one-sixth of their spiritual merit.

Our *Purāṇa* advises the king to try to win the affection and loyalty of his people. The state, the territory and the prosperity of the king arise from his popularity among his subjects.[378] It is said that the king is intended to be a source of pleasure to the people.[379] Our *Purāṇa*[380] further states that a king who oppresses the people is soon destroyed and lives in hell for an indefinite period. Obviously this threat is held to check the autocracy of the king.

Jabalpur Plates of Jayasiṁha: year 918 (c A. D. 1165 or 1166), v. 20; No. 68 Rewa Plates of Vijayasiṁha, Vikram Era 1253 (A D. 1196) v. 8, etc.

[371] *Agni*, 223.9.

[372] *Arth.*, 1.19.

[373] *NVA*, 26.66: *prajāpālanaṁ hi rājño yajño na punarbhūtānāmālambhaḥ.*

[374] *Yogayātrā*, 2.23.

[375] ASS. verse 28; cf. *Vasiṣṭha*, 19.1-2. Protection is a life long vow (*satra*) for the king.

[376] III. 323.25-26.

[377] III. 3.10-11.

[378] *Agni*, 225.33: *janānurāgaprabhavā rājño rājyamahīśriyaḥ.*

[379] *Ibid.*, 220.24: *janānurāgayā lakṣmyā rājā svājjanarañjanāt.* The popular aspect of kingship was first emphasized by Kauṭilya (*anurāge sārvaguṇyam*).

[380] *Ibid.*, 225.31: *rāṣṭrakarṣī bhraśyate cha* . . . ; 223.7: *rāṣṭrapīḍākaro rājā narake vasate chiram.*

An analysis of the duties and functions of the king, as discussed by our *Purāṇa*, shows that they are comprehensive. But stress is laid on protection in a broader sense. The king is to maintain the integrity of the state and to increase it. He is to preserve law and order so that the state and its people may prosper in every respect. Therefore the king is required to fulfill social, religious, political, economic and moral obligations.

The *Agni Purāṇa* gives some indication of the position and the privileges of the king. A kingless state is thought not fit for habitation,[381] which shows the value attached to the king's presence. The king is described as endowed with three-fold energies—enthusiasm, sovereignty and counsel, with which he is asked to protect the people like god Hari.[382] What is more important, the king is taken to be as good as an incarnation of god Viṣṇu, who preserves and nourishes the gods according to the tenets of law.[383] Hence while our *Purāṇa* expects the king to establish a regime of virtue and justice in return it expects the subjects to show the same devotion and loyalty to their king[384] as they show to a god. Furthermore, the idea of the king as an incarnation of Viṣṇu suggests the unquestioned authority of the king and inviolability of his person and orders. Nārada[385] similarly exalts the position of the king. He states that the king is without beginning and without end (like the Supreme Being), and as such he is beyond criticism unless he deviates from the prescribed rules of conduct. He further ordains that as a good wife is devoted to even a worthless husband, so the subjects should be loyal and obedient even to a worthless ruler. Our *Purāṇa* does not go to that length but all the same advocates absolutism of the king.

But royal absolutism expounded by the *Agni Purāṇa* is not naked in nature. The king has to function as a source of pleasure to the people,[386] and is held responsible for the sins of the omission and commission committed by his officeres. This shows that he is not above public criticism. Again and again he is required to return the amount of theft to the victim, if the thieves are not apprehended.[387] He is also enjoined to return to the brāhmaṇas thirty times the amount unjustly realised as fine in a law-court.[388] On the other hand for even-handed justice the king is rewarded with seven virtues—piety (*dharma*), wealth, fame, maintenance of social orders, protection, much respect from the people and a perpetual place in heaven.[389] So our *Purāṇa* thinks the king to be an incarnation of Viṣṇu because he preserves the code of conduct and nourishes the people. The emphasis on the rule of law and justice seems to be as great as the absolutism of the king.

---

[381] *Ibid.*, 155.24: *vaidyarājanadīhīne mlechchhastrībahunāyake;* cf. *Garuḍa*, I. 120.25-27; *Bṛhaddharma Purāṇa*, III. 4. 33-34 compares a land without king to a woman without a husband.

[382] *Ibid.*, 226.20: *utsāhamantraśaktyādyai rakṣedyasmāddharistataḥ.*

[383] *Ibid.*, 276.24-25: *pālitāścha surāḥ sarve viṣṇunā dharmapālanāt, rājāno rājaputrāścha munayo devatā hariḥ, yaduktam yachcha naivoktamavatāra harerime.*

[384] *Ibid.*, 151.5: *bhaktiścha nṛpatau nityaṃ...*

[385] *Smṛti-Saṁdarbha*, Calcutta, 1952, p.320 vv.13 and 22: *nirguṇo'pi yathā strīnāṁ pūjya eva patiḥ sadā, prajānāṃ nirguṇo'pyevaṃ pūjya eva narādhipaḥ.*

Royal Privileges:

In keeping with the *arthaśāstra-smṛti* traditon our *Purāṇa* invests the king with certain privileges. Severe punishments are prescribed for sexual intercourse with the queen,[390] for the use of seats and conveyance meant for the king[391], blasphemy[392] and sedition[393] against him, hostility towards him and disobedience and contravention of the royal order.[391] Regicide is declared to be the worst crime, and it is proclaimed that no impurity pertains to his relations[395] from the death of a man guilty of the king's murder.

The other type of the royal prerogatives belongs to the king as an administrative head. His writs are declared to be one of the four constituents of law (*chatuspāda*), and his orders as one of the factors helping adjudication of cases (*chatussādhana*).[396] Our *Purāṇa*, on the pattern of the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti*, declares that the non-confirmity with the royal writs or an act in contravention of the royal edicts or order forms eighteen branches of lawsuits, which are again sub-divided into a hundred sub-branches.[397] So all crimes arise from the disobedience of the king's order. Our text avers that the eyes of the man who disobeys the king's order or contravenes it should be plucked out.[398] Similarly punishment of the highest order is prescribed for those who counterfeit weights and measures, coins,[399] have connections with such persons,[400] and for those who declare bad coins to be good and *vice-versa*, and above all for those who make alterations, omissions and additions in the royal edicts.[401]

---

[386] *Agni*. 220.24, 225.14, 225.33.

[387] *Ibid.*, 223.21-22 ; 253.62, etc ; cf. *Yāj.*, 2.36 ; *VDP*, II. 61-49.

[388] *Ibid.*, 258.82 ; same as *Yāj.*, 2.307.

[389] *Ibid.*, 258.83 : *dharmaśchārthasya kīrtiśchalokapaṅktirupagrahaḥ, prajābhyo bahumānaṁ cha svargasthānam cha śāśvatam, paśyata vyavahārāṁścha guṇāḥ syuḥ sapta bhūpateḥ* ; same as Nārada, 1.27 (*vyvahāradarśan*).

[390] *Ibid.*, 227.83, 258.67.

[391] *Ibid.*, 227.64, 258.79.

[392] *Ibid.*, 155.29, 258.78.

[393] *Ibid.*, 258.8

[394] *Ibid.*, 258.80.

[395] *Ibid.*, 158.37-38.

[396] *Ibid.*, 253.3-5 ; cf. *Nārada*. 1.11 ; (but the copyist of our Purāṇa wrongly uses *sādhanam* for *śāsanaṃ* which is correct).

The third type of royal privileges described by our text are those which are the personal prerogatives of the king. In ordinary case one can claim occupancy right to movable and immovable property after ten or twenty years respectively, but the rule is not valid in the case of the king's property.[402] The unclaimed property and the property of the person who is heirless goes to the king.[403] Similarly, the king acts as a custodian of the property of an infant till he attains maturity ; of a widow who is the mother of a child, or is devoid of legitimate guardians or relations to look after her ; and of the property of a widow who remains faithful to her husband during his life and is unable to manage her property after him.[404] The king is entitled to get gems and precious stones captured in war and to divide the rest of the war-booty among his officers and soldiers.[405] He does not share public censure if he lends money on interest, on occasions sanctioned by the scriptures and to persons who seek it.[406] So far as the repayment of debt is concerned the brāhmaṇas are to be paid first and the king next.[407] Above all our text[408] provides that if the king prohibits the sale of things at a particular place, and the things fit for the use of the king such as gems, valuable stones, elephants, etc., are sold for profit without the permision of the king, they are to be escheated by him.

---

[397] *Ibid.*, 253.30-31.

[398] *Ibid.*, 258.80 ; Yāj., 2.304.

[399] *Ibid.*, 227.60-61, 258.34 ; *Yāj.*, 2.240 ; *VDP*, II. 72.183 (In verse 227.60 the compiler of our text wrongly copies *nāśaka* for *nāṇaka*).

[400] *Ibid.*, 258.34-35 ; Yāj ; 2.240-241.

[401] *Ibid.*, 227.63, 258.74 ; *VDP*, II.72. 186 ; *Yāj.*, 2.295.

[402] *Ibid.*, 253.54 ; *Yāj.*, 2.25.

[403] *Ibid.*, 223.16 ; *VDP*, II. 61.42-43 ; *Manu*, 8.30.

[404] *Ibid.*, 223.18-20 ; *VDP*, II. 61.46-47 ; *Manu*. 8.27-28.

[405] *Ibid.*, 236.63 : *ratnānirājagāmīni* and 236.66 : *saṃvibhāgaṃ parāvāptaiḥ kuryādbhṛtyajanasya cha.*

[406] *Ibid.*, 253.66 ; *Yāj.*, 2.40 ; cf. *Manu*, 8.49.

[407] *Ibid.*, 254.1 ; *Yāj.*, 2.41.

[408] *Ibid.*, 258.51 : *vyāsiddhaṃ rājayogyaṃ cha vikrītaṃ rājagāmi tat* : cf. *Yāj.*, 2.261. M. N. Dutt wrongly translates the verse to mean that a

The king and his servants, according to the *Agni Purāṇa*, become free from impurities, resultant from the death of his relation, by just taking purificatory bath.[409] The people, it seems, think it a great privilege to meet the king, and so auspicious occasions for seeing him are fixed by our text.[410] Kauṭilya[411] advises the king to give audience to all the petitioners at all times,—a principle actually put into practice by Aśoka.[412] With the Gupta period, we find the *pratīhāra* (usherers) allowing the people to have audience with the king. In the period represented by our *Purāṇa* it seems to have become more difficult to obtain royal audience. On the whole the king's prerogatives relate to his person, to his efficiency of administration, and to economic and social matters. These prerogatives are traditional and adopted from earlier sources with some minor mistakes on the part of the copyist of our text.[413] We come across similar royal prerogatives recommended by Kauṭilya, which are more in number and wider in extent than in any other work on polity. The king is charged with the duty of both Yama and Indra, and whoever disregards him is to be visited with divine punishments so that the king is never to be despised. Kauṭilya's punishment for treason and the trespass of king's prerogatives is severe, but our *Purāṇa* follows the *smṛtis* in softening the harsh punishments. So the prerogatives and privileges of the king lose their old importance in our period. Our conclusion is supported by Fahien, who informs us that corporal punishment was least used in his time, and in case of repeated rebellions the right hand of the rebel was cut off.[414] Hsüan Tsang[415] also testifies to the lightness of punishment in such cases. He informs us that there was no corporal punishment, and, for breaking the law and violating the powers of the rulers, the offenders were simply imprisoned. So we find a gradual deterioration in the privileges of the

---

thing fit for the use of the king should go to the king, as rights of sovereignty. (*Eng. Tr.*, p. 938).

[409] *Ibid.*, 157.33.

[410] *Ibid.*, 121.42-43 and 127.18.

[411] *Arth.*, 1.19.

[412] Mookerji, R. K., *Aśoka*, 1955, pp. 143-146 (Rock Edict VI).

[413] *Arth.*, 1.13.

[414] *Travels of Hiouen Thsang*, Vol.I, p.21.

[415] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p.139.

king. At one place our text[416] makes an important change in the verse quoted by it from Yājñavalkya, and replaces punishment of the highest amercement by the middle one for using the seat and conveyance of the king. Decrease in the king's privilege may point to some weakening of central government in our period.

---

[416] 258.79; cf. *Yāj.*, 2.303.

CHAPTER IV

ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANISATION

Ministers:

Next to the king are placed the *mantrins*. The *Agni Purāṇa* summarises the *Amarakośa* and offers for the ministers at one place the following synonyms—*mantrī*, *dhīsachiva*, *amātya*, *mahāmātya* and *pradhāna* ;[1] at another place it simply uses the term *mahāmātya*.[2] The exact technical meaning of each one of these terms is not clear. Even if we accept these synonyms, we do not understand whether *amātya* and *mahāmātya* or *mahāmātra* are the same and whether there is any difference in their legal and political status. All these terms have been translated by modern writers as *mantrī* or minister, though at times they have tried to differentiate between them. The *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya shows that the *amātyas* formed a general cadre of officers from whom high functionaries were appointed.

From the chapters on polity in the *Agni Purāṇa* it seems that *amātyas* are different from the *sachivas* and the *mantrins*. The difference is more marked between the *amātya* and the *mantrin*. The king gives audience to *amātyas* and *mantrins* in the royal court. Both these terms are used simultaneously at two different places,[3] perhaps to point out the difference in their position. If both of these indicate the same functionaries, two separate terms need not have been used. This is also clear from Kāmandaka, who compares the *amātyas* and the crown prince to the arms of the king and the *mantrins* to his eyes.[4] This may indicate their administrative and supervisory duties. Even the *Nītivākyāmṛta*[5] devotes two different sections to them. The treatment meted out to the *amātyas* proves their inferior position and supports the view expressed by Kauṭilya. Bhoja, a contemporary writer, at first, states the qualifications of an *amātya* and then adds a few more for a *mantrin*.[6]

It appears from the *Agni Purāṇa* that *amātyas* are different from *sachivas* as well. After the coronation the usherer (*pratīhāra*) comes with *amātyas* and *sachivas* to introduce them to the newly consecrated king.[7] The simultaneous use of these terms shows their difference. Even the weak points of the *amātyas* and the *sachivas* are separately discussed.[8] There is a view based on the inscription of Rudradāmana that the *amātyas* were more commonly known as *sachivas* in the post-Maurya period,[9] but this does not seem to be true of the period in which the *Agni Purāṇa* was compiled.

---

[1] *Agni*, 366.2 : cf. Amar., II. 8.4-5.
[2] *Ibid.*, 106.11.
[3] *Ibid.*, 226.11 ; 235.8.
[4] *KNS*, 17.26.
[5] Section 10 (*mantrin*) ; Section 18 (*amātva*)
[6] *Yukti.*, p.3, vv. 18-19.

It is significant that the *Agni Purāṇa* uses the terms, *amātyasachivādīṁścha,*[10] *mantrāmātyātmajādikāḥ*[11] and *amātyāmantriṇastathā,*[12] but nowhere the word *sachiva* is used along with the term *mantrī* to differentiate their position. This may lead us to think that they are perhaps the same officers. Similar is the case with Kāmandaka. The confusion regarding their relative status, however, still persists. The *Agni Purāṇa*[13] discusses the qualifications of the *sachiva* and the *amātya* separately. That at times they constitute two different categories is corroborated by the *Nītiprakāśikā,*[14] which, while putting the number of the *sachivas* at seven or eight, suggests the appointment of two or three *mantrins* by the king.[15] The *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi,* though a late work of early 12th century, uses the three terms—*amātya, sachiva,* and *mantrin* side by side. It asks the *amātyas*, the *sachivas* and the *mantrins* to take their respective seats in the court allotted by the king,[16] and to occupy their respective residence in different quarters of the city.[17] It further advises the king to give shelter to and placate angry and disillusioned *mantrins, sachivas, amātyas* along with feudal lords and respectable persons of his enemies' country.[18]

The foregoing discussion shows that during the period of the final compilation of this *Purāṇa* there were some kingdoms in which *sachivas* were equated with the *mantrins* while there were still others where the *amātyas, sachivas* and the *mantrins* were quite different in status.

---

[7] *Agni,* 218.31.

[8] *Ibid.,* 241.16-18.

[9] Sharma, R. S., *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India,* p.17.

[10] 218.31.

[11] 226.11.

[12] 235.8.

[13] 239.10-15 ; 239.15-16.

[14] 8.18.

[15] *Ibid.,* 8.19.

[16] *Abilaṣi.,* III. 11.1260 ; and also see III. 11.1297.

[17] *Ibid.,* I. 2.1072 (It is interesting to note that different terms are used for their houses also, *sadana, nivāsa, gṛha* and *niketana*).

[18] *Ibid.,* I. 2.1003.

The term *mahāmātya* is used by the *Agni Purāṇa* more probably in the sense of prime minister as no other synonyms e.g. *mahāmantrī*,[19] *guptipradhāna*,[20] *mantripravara*[21] as used in contemporary literature are found herein. Residence in the capital is provided to him and to no other officer as such.[22] The term *pradhāna* of the *Agni Purāṇa*[23] may also mean prime minister, but there is every possibility of his being only a minister as is borne out by the term *aṣṭapradhāna* of Śivājī. On the other hand we find the term *mahāmātya* used in the sense of prime minister in a contemporary work, the *Viddhaśālabhañjikā*[24] of Rājaśekhara. He also uses the term *mahāmantrī* for one Bhāgurāyaṇa,[25] probably identical with Bhākamiśra, who is called not simply *pradhāna* but *mantripradhāna* in the Kārītalai Stone Inscription of Lakṣmaṇarāja II.[26] It is not known whether the *mahāmātya* in the period was 'first among equals' or was really as powerful and honoured as Bhākamiśra of the inscription.

In the section on coronation the *Agni Purāṇa* lays down that the ministers (*mantrin*) should possess all kinds of knowledge (*akhilātmajñān*).[27] In a similar context the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* devotes a full chapter to the enumeration of the qualities, which are generally required of a *mantrin*.[28] The *Agni Purāṇa*, in another chapter, borrows *verbatim* verses from Kāmandaka to describe the respective qualities of the king, the *mantrin* and the *purohita*.[29] After a comparison between the two texts, we find that many qualifications provided by Kāmandaka for the king are assigned by the *Agni Purāṇa* to the ministers.[30] It is done by omitting some important verses of the *Kāmandaka Nītisāra*.[31] The omission can be explained by the ignorance of the compiler of the *Agni*

---

[19] *Viddhaśāla*., pp. 74,75 and 145.
[20] *KNS*, 4.60.
[21] *Ibid*., 15.46.
[22] *Agni*, 106.11.
[23] 366.2.
[24] P. 143.
[25] *Ibid*., pp.16. 74, 75 and 145.
[26] *CII*, IV, No.42 verse 6.
[27] 218.4.
[28] *VDP*, II. chapter 6.
[29] *Chapter* 239.
[30] *Agni*, 239.5-19 ; cf. KNS, 4.6-20.
[31] *KNS* 4.20-24.

Purāṇa or by his desire to make the list of qualifications of ministers more elaborate than that of Kāmandaka. Nonetheless the transfer of the qualities of the king to the ministers shows their growing importance in the age when this text of the *Agni Purāṇa* was compiled.[32]

The *Nītivākyāmṛta*[33] gives eight and the *Yuktikalpataru*[34] ten qualifications of the ministers. The *Agni Purāṇa* provides two fairly long lists of their qualifications which, even when combined, is shorter than in the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa.*[35]

We find two alternative lists of ministers' qualifications in the *Agni Purāṇa.*[36] The second one is nothing but a reproduction of the first; it only adds that the minister should be a native (*jānapadaḥ*)[37]. Both these lists occur even in the *Nītisāra*, but they seem to have been borrowed from two different sources, the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya and the old *smṛti* traditions.

Though the *Agni Purāṇa* follows the old tradition of Kauṭilya and requires the minister to be a native, it does not lay the same emphasis on this point as the *Nītivākyāmṛta*, which declares it to be the most important requisite.[38] The long list provided by the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* does not mention this particular quality of the minister. The earlier *smṛtis*, the epics and the *Yuktikalpataru*, are silent on this point. Perhaps there are two different schools of ideas during this period. The *arthaśāstra*[39] school always attaches a great importance to local birth, but the brāhmaṇical school represented by the epics and the *smṛtis* seems to ignore it,[40] perhaps to give chance to learned brāhmaṇas to serve in any kingdom. In a late commentary on the *Śaṅkhalikhita Smṛti*, which is quoted by Lakṣmīdhara[41] and the *Vīramitrodaya*[42], the ministers, qualifications *pratyanteṣu* and *maula* are explained to mean

---

[32] We notice that the copyist of the *Nītisāra* of Kāmandaka probably makes a mistake in copying *cha* as *va* and thus writes *parivāraṁ* instead of *parichāraṁ* in the *Agni Purāṇa* which seems to be more appropriate. (*Agni*, 239.6 ; cf. *KNS*, 4.10).

[33] 10 5.

[34] p. 2, vv. 18-19.

[35] II. chapter 6.

[36] 239.6-12 and 239.12-16.

[37] 239.12.

[38] *NVA*, 10.6: *samastapakṣapāteṣu svadeśa pakṣapāto mahān.*

[39] *Arth.*, 1.9 ; *KNS*, 4.28.

[40] *Manu*, 7.54 : *Yāj.*, 1.310 ; *Mbh. Āśram.*, 5.20.

[41] *Kṛtyakalpataru Rājadharmakāṇḍa*, p. 32.

[42] *Vīramitrodaya*, pp.18 ff.

'within the frontiers of his own territory' and 'those born in that particular country' respectively. In older literature the term *maula* means hereditary, and not a native as suggested by the commentator, who may have been influenced by the *arthaśāstra* school.[43]

On the problem of the caste (*varṇa*) of the ministers also there existed two schools. The *Agni Purāṇa* follows the *Arthaśāstra* view and does not enjoin that only a brāhmaṇa should be appointed to the post of a minister as is done by other brāhmaṇical sources[44]. It shows a marked liberalism in this period. The *Nītivākyāmṛta*[45] recommends the three higher castes for the post of ministers. The *Yuktikalpataru*[46] extends this privilege even to people of low status or, perhaps, caste during times of distress. Such a statement reflects the actual condition prevailing in different kingdoms of India. We know of a Kāyastha or a śūdra family founded by Gollāka which supplied ministers to the Kalachuris of Tripuri for several generations.[47] It seems that the *Agni Purāṇa*[48] favours the appointment of a kṣatriya as minister of justice. At one place it states that the minister should be able to recite and execute the laws of justice or *daṇḍanīti*, and at another opines that in matters of justice kṣatriyas should be preferred.[49] On the other hand, Somadeva is suspicious, particularly, of the kṣatriyas and states that those who live on arms should not be appointed ministers, since they press for the adoption of their own views by force of arms.[50] The unknown commentator of the *Nītivākyāmṛta* quotes the views of Jaimini and Varga to support this idea.[51] But vaiśyas are not declared unfit for ministership by any authority on such grounds. However, it should not lead us to the conclusion that they are to be appointed freely.

Though we find two important lady officers in the *Agni Purāṇa*,[52] there is nothing to suggest the appointment of women to the post of minister. Perhaps, on account of the low position of women in society, which thought that women were in the habit of divulging secrets, they

---

43 As this view was not accepted by Chaṇḍeśvara (*RR*, p.10).
44 *Manu*, 7.58 ; *Yāj.*, 1.310 ; *Mbh. Āśrama.*, 5.20 ; *VDP*, II. 6.1.
45 10.5
46 p. 2 verse 19: *hīnaśchāpyuprodhena bhūpamantrī prakīrttitaḥ.*
47 *CII*, IV. Introduction, p. cxi.
48 239.12.
49 *Ibid.*, 239.33: *advaidhakṣatriyaprāyo daṇḍo . . .*
50 *NVA*, 10.101-103.
51 *Ibid.*, pp.136 and 137.
52 220 3 ; 220.9.

are never considered fit for such posts. The *Agni Purāṇa* advises the king not to repose faith even in his own queen.[53] Chaṇḍeśvara also quotes an old authority, which definitely prohibits the appointment of lady ministers.[54]

Similarly our *Purāṇa* neither prescribes any age limit nor clearly prohibits the appointment of a boy, unlike an authority quoted by Chaṇḍeśvara. Nevertheless, ministers are required to possess experience of mature years (*vṛddhopadeśasampannaḥ*[55]). Thus they are to be sufficiently advanced in age so as to command respect from all sections of the realm including the king. We find such an illustrious minister in Someśvara Bhaṭṭa, who was not only respected by all sections of people but whose palanquin was borne even by the Chedi king Lakṣmaṇarāja II (c A.D. 940-965). Perhaps he was too old and feeble to relieve the king by going to the temple on foot.[56]

We find the *Agni Purāṇa*[57] enjoining the king to appoint only such persons as are prepared to stand up to public indignation and censure for his cause. As against this view the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* advises the king to appoint those who are popular among his subjects.[58] Thus while the latter may expect an unpopular minister to be dismissed by the king, the former may like him to retain the minister for his own cause. So the *Agni Purāṇa* introduces an element of autocracy in government machinery. Such an attitude on the part of the *Agni Purāṇa* indicates its adherence to the *arthaśāstra* tradition, which favours a despotic centralised government.

Lastly, we may summarise the qualifications of the ministers as enumerated by our *Purāṇa* under four broader groups. First, the minister should be endowed with such personal qualities as may enable him to command obedience and respect from all sections of people. These qualities are mentioned as noble birth, eloquence, modesty, honesty, etc. Second, he should possess qualities, which may guarantee his loyalty to the king and the country, e.g. birth in the same country, absence of fickle mindedness, etc. Third, he should have also qualifications necessary for efficient execution of his duties, e.g. knowledge of *daṇḍanīti*, arts and crafts, and other *śāstras*, ability to negotiate war and peace, knowledge of secret counsel and preparations going on in neighbouring countries, and, finally, he should be free from certain bad qualities such as anger, greed, fear, untruthfulness, etc.

---

[53] *Ibid.*, 239.48.

[54] *RR*, p.13.

[55] *Agni*, 239.10 ; Dutt, M. N., *Eng. Tr.*, Vol. II, p.854.

[56] *CII*, IV, Part 1, p.190, verse 17 of the Kārītalai Inscription of Lakṣmaṇarāja II.

[57] 239.7.

[58] *VDP*, II. 6.3.

As regards the number of the *mantrins* or the *sachivas*, the *Agni Purāṇa* merely informs that Daśaratha had eight ministers,[59] and Rāvaṇa seven.[60] This description is based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Older *smṛtis* such as those of Manu and Yājñavalkya fix their strength at seven or eight,[61] an idea reproduced by late works and digests on *smṛtis*, e.g. the *Nīti-prakāśikā*, the *Rājadharmakāṇḍa* of the *Kṛtyakalpataru*, the *Rājanīti-Ratnākara*, the *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi*,[62] etc. Śivājī seems to have followed this *smṛti* tradition in constituting his council of ministers called the *aṣṭapradhāna*. However, Somadeva Sūri discusses the evils of appointing one or two ministers and so recommends a council of either three, five or seven.[63] He illustrates the principle in his other literary work the *Yaśastilaka*, which provides for five ministers.[64] On the other hand there are some older political thinkers who put the number variously at twelve, sixteen or even twenty.[65] The *Agni Purāṇa* does not speculate on their numerical strength but perhaps leaves it to the king to decide their number after considering the exigencies of his kingdom. Like other late *Purāṇas*,[66] and the didactic portions of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*, the *Agni Purāṇa* advises the king to consult neither one nor many. In case it is necessary to hold deliberations with more than one minister, the king should seek their advice separately.[67] This instruction is repeated twice,[68] which suggests that in the absence of joint advice the ministers would not be able to influence the king's policy much. In all probability the number of ministers, envisaged in the *Agni Purāṇa*, is neither too large nor too small.

Our text gives us some idea regarding the time and place for consulting the ministers. In the king's daily routine the item of holding counsel with his ministers follows his adjudication of civil and criminal cases.[69] After the deliberations are over the king goes to practise gymnastics and take his midday bath.[70] It only repeats the ancient tradition contained in the earlier *Purāṇas*.[71] It is not clear whether such consultations are held at night. The *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi*,[72] however, lays down that the king should hold counsel with his ministers at noon after meals and in the later part of the night when he is refreshed after sleep. This seems to be the basis of the medieval *durbār*, which the king holds after finishing his daily personal work, but such a practice is not found in the *Agni Purāṇa*.

---

[59] 6.3.

[60] 9.7.

[61] *Manu*, 7.54 ; *Mit.* on *Yāj.*, 1.312.

[62] *NP*, 8.18 ; *Rājadharmakāṇḍa*, p.22 , *RR*, p. 10 ; *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.58.

[63] *NVA*, 10.66-73.

[64] *Yaśas.*, III. pp.375-94.

[65] *KNS*, 11.67.

[66] *VDP*, II.65.39, 151.20 ; *Matsya*, 219.37 ; *Kālikā Purāṇa*, 84.104.105 ; *Bṛhaddharma Purāṇa Uttarakhaṇḍa*, 3.3.

[67] *Agni*, 225.19 ; *Matsya*, 214.47.

[68] *Ibid.*, 225.18 and 235.10.

Though the *Agni Purāṇa* suggests the time of deliberations it nowhere suggests the place, so meticulously described by Kauṭilya,[73] the *Mahābhārata*,[74] the *Nītiprakāśikā*,[75] or even by a later work the *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi*.[76] The only indication of the place is found in the injunction that every possibility of the secrets leaking out should be avoided.[77] This suggests that the place is intended to be secret.

The *Agni Purāṇa* nowhere discusses the functions of the ministers, which, however, can be inferred from an analysis of their qualifications. They are asked to be well-versed in the policy of war and peace and to possess an up-to-date knowledge of the secret counsel and preparations being carried on among other neighbouring countries.[78] This is to be done through a network of espionage system, which the minister is supposed to organise and maintain.[79] A *sachiva* is called *sandhivigrahatatvavit*,[80] which shows that he is expected to conduct inter-state relations and occupy the post of *sāndhivigrahika*.[81]

The ministers are expected to win the allegiance of the enemies of the king to their master and to make them obedient[82] to him, just as a tame elephant helps to bring the wild one under control.[83] They are, perhaps, commissioned to put down revolts of the governors of frontiers and officers in charge of border and the forest.[84] Thus in times of emergency they have also military duties to perform.

---

[69] *Ibid.*, 235.9.
[70] *Ibid.*, 235.13.
[71] *VDP*, II. 151.19 and 31.
[72] I. 2.704.
[73] *Arth.*, 1.15.
[74] *Udyoga.*, 38.17-18 and *Śānti.*, 83.57.
[75] 8.68-69.
[76] I. 2.703.
[77] *Agni*, 225.15.
[78] *Ibid.*, 239.8.
[79] *Ibid.*, 239.8.
[80] *Ibid.*, 239.8.
[81] *Ibid.*, 220.3.
[82] *Ibid.*, 239.15.

The *Agni Purāṇa* seems to assign some judicial functions to the ministers, as it expects them to expound and to execute the principles of *daṇḍanīti*.[85] Though they are well-versed in *śāstras*, they are expected to cultivate them through discourses with elders and experts in *śrutis*.[86] So they become not only expounders of justice but also patrons of religion and learning. The same function is enjoined by Rājaśekhara.[87]

The *Agni Purāṇa* instructs the ministers to attend vigorously to financial matters[88] and to appoint some minor officers, for higher functionaries are to be appointed by the king. The *Agni* and other late *Purāṇas* advise royal servants to always show respect to the *mantrins*,[89] who might trouble them in matters of promotion, demotion or transfer.

Just before the formal coronation of the king, which takes place after a year of his accession to the throne, he nominates the ministers (*mantrins*) along with the astrologer, the family priest and the chief queen, and according to some manuscripts even the officiating priest (*ṛtvija*[90]). It is not clear whether other *sachivas* and *amātyas* are also to be appointed on that occasion. Their appointment is dealt with in a separate chapter, which follows the chapter dealing with the coronation ceremony.[91] After the coronation ceremony the *amātyas*, the *sachivas* and others are displayed before the king and probably introduced to him by the *pratīhāra*.[92] The *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* lays down that only *amātyas*, chiefs of guilds, rich merchants and the people should be introduced to the king, but makes no mention of the *sachivas*.[93] Probably it takes *amātyas* in a broader sense so as to include all high functionaries such as *mantrins, sachivas, senāpati*, etc., who are expected to be present at the time of the king's consecration.

---

[83] *Ibid.*, 220.15.

[84] *KNS*, 15.21.

[85] *Agni*, 239.12.

[86] *Ibid.*, 239. 10-11.

[87] *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*, p.14.

[88] 239.15: *tatparatārtheṣu*; cf. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, VI. 6.47: *arthasādhanamantriṇaḥ*; *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.56: *āyavyaye cha nipuṇaḥ sachivaḥ kośavṛddhaye.*

[89] *Agni*, 221.10; *VDP*, II. 25.25.

[90] *Ibid.*, 218.3-4; *Ibid.*, Āss. p.267n.

[91] *Ibid.*, chapter 239.

[92] *Ibid.*, 218.31.

[93] *VDP*, II. 21.36.

The *sachivas* and the *mantrins* are supposed to give sound advice to the king. *Mantrins* mean counsellors, and its synonyms are *sachiva, dhīsachiva, amātya*, etc. *Dhī* means wisdom, and *amātya* and *sachiva* mean one who lives close to the king. The king is enjoined to hold daily deliberations with the *mantrins*.[94] The advice of these ministers is considered very important. The *Agni Purāṇa* states that the king gains lusture (*vibhūti*) by closely following the advice of astrologers, physicians and above all the ministers.[95]

The *Agni Purāṇa* gives the following traditional five-fold division of consultations:—

(i) appointing assistants for executing a plan (*sahāyaḥ*),
(ii) finding out means and equipment to achieve the target (*sādhnopāyā*),
(iii) fixing up the right time (*kālavibhāga*),
(iv) fixing up the right place (*deśavibhāga*), and
(v) finding out ways to ward off dangers (*vipatteśchapratīkāraḥ*).

Advice is to be tendered to the king on these aspects of a subject.[96]

The ministers are supposed

(i) to possess knowledge of things which are not known, so that they might plan for future,
(ii) to decide upon the ways and means of achieving the plan in hand,
(iii) to remove doubts and ambiguities of the meaning, and
(iv) finally to see the plan to its successful end.[97]

Contemporary literature such as the *Nītivākyāmṛta* lays down a similar procedure, but it adds that after the final adoption of a particular plan the minister should pursue the work vigorously (*niśchitasya balādhānaṁ*).[98] On the model of the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya it states that those who begin which is not begun, complete which is begun and improve which is already done are called *mantrins*.[99] But they cannot be successful in their aims if they are not attentive, cheerful, faithful and are endowed with ability and energy to do and secure co-operation from their assistants.[100]

---

[94] *Agni*, 235.9 ; *VDP*, II. 151.27.
[95] *Ibid.*, 235.13.
[96] *Ibid.*, 241.4.
[97] *Ibid.*, 241.3.
[98] *NVA*. 10.23.
[99] *Ibid.*, 10.24.

It is ordained by the *Agni Purāṇa* that ministers should protect the king, perhaps, against all kinds of vices (*vyasana*) which bring about his downfall.[101] The *Kāmandaka Nītisāra* endorses this and enjoins the minister to help the king to come out of the ditch of affection (*rāga*), pride (*māna*) and arrogance (*mada*).[102] It compares a minister with the driver of an elephant who keeps him on the right path.[103]

The enumeration of qualifications and the duties and functions ascribed to the ministers by the *Agni Purāṇa* shows their exalted position. The *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* calls the king *mantrisaṁvatsarādhīnaḥ*,[104] i. e. servile to the minister and the astrologer. The growing power of the ministers is regarded by our text as a menace to the position of the king, and the king is advised to dismiss disloyal and appoint loyal servants.[105]

The *Agni Purāṇa*, like Kauṭilya and Kāmandaka, declares the counsel of ministers to be the best source of king's strength,[106] advises him to be always guided by it.[107] The ministers are consulted on every matter of the state, including the king's coronation and the consecration of the crownprince, and so they are appointed before the coronation takes place. We learn that Daśaratha consulted his ministers about the proposed consecration of Rāmachandra as crownprince of Ayodhyā.[108] According to our *Purāṇa* they are perhaps to be taken into confidence regarding the marriage of the king and the selection of the *mahiṣī* or the chief queen.[109] We find in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* Udayana, the king of Vatsa, consulting his ministers and especially his chief minister Yaugandharāyaṇa on every matter including his marriage with Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī.[110] The same source shows that the king sometimes leaves the affairs of the state to the ministers[111] and himself remains a passive spectator.[112] Nārada advises Udayana to respect the advice of his ministers as his (Nārada's) in order to gain unlimited wealth and lusture.[113] Otherwise the king loses all his power and is invaded by his enemies.[114] Our text also lays down that the king should always follow the advice of his ministers to gain lusture.[115] It describes the revolt of the *mantrins* as that of the inner circle (*antaḥ kopa*) which is more dangerous than the revolt of the feudatories (*sāmanta*) living in the outer circle (*bāhya kopa*).[116] So it seems that the ministers are thought to be very powerful during the early medieval period.

---

[100] *Agni*, 241.5.
[101] *Ibid.*, 239.7.
[102] *KNS*, 4.48.
[103] *Ibid.*, 4.49.
[104] *VDP*, II. 3.6.
[105] *Agni*, 221.11.
[106] *Ibid.*, 241.1.
[107] *Ibid.*, 235.12.
[108] *Ibid.*, 6.3-4.
[109] *Ibid.*, 218.4.
[110] Cf. in the *Viddhaśālabhañjikā* Bhāgurāyaṇa contracts the second and the third marriage of the king.

The compiler of the *Agni Purāṇa* is suspicious of the influence of the ministers over other officers, and so asks the latter not to repose faith in the *sachiva* but to do only such things as are pleasing to the king.[117] Moreover, the king is nowhere advised in our *Purāṇa* to commission ministers to supervise all the state affairs either in his absence[118] or in the period of his preoccupation with works of *dharma* and *artha*, or during his illness.[119] We can get some idea of the distrust of the ministers from the statement that the king should neither divulge the secret counsels to the ministers nor should he always rely on any one of them.[120] It is done perhaps to secure complete secrecy of the deliberations and to check concentration of power in a single minister, so that the king may enjoy the confidence and help of other ministers. Nevertheless, the king is asked to discuss the matter with many ministers but follow the advice of only one.[121] Perhaps our *Purāṇa* thinks it difficult for the king to accommodate the views of all.

---

[111] *Kathās.*, II. 1.14-15. II.3.2.

[112] *Ibid.*, II.3.5: *mantriṇām cha mukhachchhāyaṁ vatsarājaḥ samaṃ papo.*

[113] *Ibid.*, III. 1.46.

[114] *KNS*, 12.52, 11.75.

[115] *Agni*, 235.12-13.

[116] *Ibid.*, 226.11.

[117] *Ibid.*, 221.11.

[118] *Kathās.*, II. 1.14-15.

[119] *KNS*, 13.60: *tasmindharmārthayoravyagre tathā chāsvasthachetasi, sarvametadaśeṣeṇa mantrī sandhātumarhati;* However, the *Agni Purāṇa* asks the king to appoint a brāhmaṇa to adjudicate legal suits with the help of assessors, when he is himself preoccupied with other works.

[120] *Agni*, 225.19-20: *mantriṇāmapi no kuryānmantrī mantraprakāśanaṁ,*
kvāpi kasyāpi viśvāso bhavatīḥ sadā nṛṇāṁ
niśchayaścha tathā mantre kārya eken sūriṇā.

[121] *Supra.*

An analysis of the powers, functions, and the position of the *mantrin* or the *sachiva* reflects the political condition of the period in which our text was finally compiled. The political weakness of the kings needed more skilled and gifted ministers, who sometimes became even more powerful than the king and sometimes king-makers. We find Gopāla, the founder of the Pāla dynasty, being elected as king by the ministers (*prakṛtis*). Such references are to be found in contemporary literature and inscriptions. Our *Purāṇa* informs us that after Daśaratha's death *Vasiṣṭha* and other ministers including Sumantra brought Bharata from the place of his maternal uncle and requested him to be the king.[122] The *Kathāsaritsāgara*[123] in one of its stories states that Vikramaśakti was made king by the ministers of his father. Though our *Purāṇa* seems to prefer competent ministers and advises the king to follow their advice, it does not seem to like their arrogance, power and influence.

The *Agni Purāṇa* does not use any term which may indicate collective functioning or collective responsibility of the ministers. On the other hand, it prescribes separate consultation with ministers by the king. It is also not known whether the ministers are required to tender written or oral advice and whether any records of their advice are maintained. Since ministers are to be consulted individually, collective influence is out of question. Thus the *mantrins* or the *sachivas* as described in the *Agni Purāṇa* are high functionaries of the state consulted by the king on every matter, owing loyalty to him rather than to the people. They are in office as long as they enjoy the confidence and sweet will of the king. Nevertheless, they seem to be very powerful and have a share in fixing the policies of the realm.

Our *Purāṇa* refers to a new type of minister, not mentioned in the early sources. He is the *narmasachiva*, first referred to by Kāmandaka.[124] According to our *Purāṇa* he is in charge of king's dress and pastimes (*śṛṅgāra*),[125] and thus is compared to the king's assistants in affairs of love or *śṛṅgāra-sahāya*.[126] For a proper understanding of the duties and position of this type of minister, we should try to know the meaning of the terms *narma* and *śṛṅgāra*. The term *narma* is extensively used in classical Sanskrit literature. The *Mahābhārata* uses the term to mean jokes and laughter, and Monier-Williams translates it as pastimes and amusements.[127] *Śṛṅgāra* according to him means dress, pastimes and love affairs.[128] The term *narmasachiva* is broken into *narmasu+sachiva* in the *Vāchaspatyam*, and *narman+sachiva* in the St. Petersberg dictionary. However, it makes no much difference in the meaning. Thus the *Vāchaspatyam* calls the *narmasachiva* a jester or the *parihāsasahāya.*[129] The word *śṛṅgāra-sahāya* has a parallel in the *kelisachiva* of the *Medinī Koṣa* and the *Śabdakalpadruma.*[130] The *Kathāsaritsāgara* uses a somewhat similar term having the same meaning, when it introduces the *narmasuhṛd* Basantaka[131] as one of the three important ministers of Udayana, the legendry king of Vatsa. We find the appointment of Tapantaka, son of Basantaka, as the *krīḍāsakhā* or *krīḍāsachiva* of Naravāhanadatta.[132] Basantaka's post as the *narmasuhṛd* was hereditary.[133] He secretly organised the marriage of Udayana with Mañjulikā, a princess sent by Udayana's brother-in-law Gopālaka.[134] The term *narmasuhṛd* has recently been translated as *narmasachiva.*[135] So we get an idea of the duties and position of the *narmasachiva* from the character of Basantaka. He practises mimicry (*narmahāsaṁ*),[136] tells stories to amuse the king and his queen,[137] and goes in disguise to Pāṭaliputra with queen Vāsavadattā[138] to protect her. Māgha tells that the moon acted as the *narmasachiva* of Rāvaṇa.[139]

---

[122] *Agni*, 6.46.

[123] II. 2.60: *datto vikramaśaktiścha rājye sambhūya mantribhiḥ.*

[124] 5.20.

[125] 339.39, *śṛṅgāre narmasachivaḥ.*

[126] *MW*, p.1087.

The *Yaśastilaka Champū* also throws some light on the duties of the *narmasachiva.* Here we find king Māridatta surrounded by the sons of the *narmasachiva,*[140] in his amusements such as drinking, hunting, etc. They were of the same nature and avocation as Māridatta. Śaṅkhanaka, maternal grandson (*dauhitra*) of the *narmasachiva* Kitava (actually meaning fraudulent), works as an important spy. Śrutadeva Sūri,[141] the commentator of the *Yaśastilaka*, looks upon *narmasachiva* as a buffoon or *bhāṇḍa*. Though the *narmasachiva* is not named in this work, the utterances attributed to him show that he was a court-jester as well as a minister endowed with political sagacity.[142]

---

[127] *Ibid.*, s. v. '*narma*'

[128] *Ibid.*, s. v. '*śṛṅgāra*'.

[129] Vol. V, p.3982.

[130] The term has been translated in the *Sanskrit Wörterbuch* as '*der für Belustigungen Sorge tragende Minister*'. The same dictionary offers this translation for the term *narmasachiva* '*der Gefährte eines Fürsten, der diensendurch Scherz und Spassee aufheitert*' *Ibid.*, Vol. Vol IV, p. 63.

[131] *Kathās.*, II. 1.44.

[132] *Ibid.*, VI. 8.115.

[133] *Supra.*

[134] *Ibid.*, IV. 6.70.

[135] *Ibid.*, Hindi translation by Kedar Nath Sharma Saraswat, Patna, 1960.

[136] *Ibid.*, I. 6.88.

[137] *Ibid.*, III. 3.63, III. 2.69.

[138] *Ibid.*, *Taraṅga* 2.

[139] *Śiśupālavadha*, 1.59: *na narmasāchivyamakāṛi nendunā.*

[140] *Yaśas.*, Vol. I, p.26.

However, the *narmasachiva* is not merely a *vidūṣaka*, with whom he is identified by some modern writers.[143] Our *Purāṇa* knows the difference between the two and takes them as two different characters in drama.[144] As *śṛṅgāra-sahāya* Monier-Williams[145] takes him to be a confidant of a dramatic hero, and so he seems to possess some knowledge of his (king's) secrets besides being his companion in amusements.[146] We find an important *narmasachiva* Chārāyaṇa in the *Viddhaśāla-bhañjikā*,[147] a drama by Rājaśekhara. Only Chārāyaṇa along with the king of Kuntala knew the real sex of his (king's) pretended son, which is revealed at the time of his marriage with the king of Tripurī. So Jīvānanda, in his commentary, has translated the word as *rahasya-sahāya*[148] or the minister in charge of private and personal affairs of the king. It is only Rudrabhaṭa who lays down the qualifications of the *narmasachiva* and states that he should be of pure character, loyal, and possess ability to keep secrets, to amuse and to speak fluently.[149] Inscriptions refer to such ministers looking after king's private affairs, who are called *rahasyādhikṛta*[150], *rahasya*[151] or in Prākṛta form the *rahasādhikata*.[152] They compose epigraphic land charters granting villages. In the fourteenth century we come across *narmasachiva* Bhoganātha, an uterine brother of the famous scholar ministers, Sāyaṇāchārya and Mādhavāchārya, writing verses on the royal edict, granting villages to brāhmaṇas during the reign of the Vijayanagara king Saṁgama (II).[153]

---

[141] *Ibid.*, pp.26n and 399n.
[142] *Ibid.*, p.471.
[143] *Kathās.*, p.125.
[144] *Agni*, 239.39.
[145] *MW*, p.1087.
[146] *Ibid.*, p.530.
[147] *Viddhaśāla.*, p.143: *smṛtivaiśāradyaṁ mahārājā narmasachivasya chārāyanasya.*
[148] *Ibid.*, p.143n.
[149] *Çṛṅgāratilaka*, Ed. R. Pischel, Kiel, 1886, I. 39: *gūḍhamatraḥ śuchir-vāgmī bhakto narmavichaksaṇaḥ, syānnarmasachivastasya...*
[150] *EI*, VI, p.132n, Kūdagere Plates of Vijayaśiva Māndhātrivarman.
[151] *EI*, III, p.21n, Almanda Plates of Anantavarman, son of Rājendravarman (Ganga Era 304).
[152] *EI*, I, p.7 line 5.

The *narmasachiva*, on account of his close association with the king as his private secretary, might have been very powerful and have influenced the king's views. So Kāmandaka advises the royal servants not to speak harshly to the *narmasachiva*.[154] The importance of this type of minister is manifest from the eighth century onwards. We find mention of this minister in contemporary literature as well as in the inscriptions. His influence over a king engrossed in passions and amusements, like Udayana in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, may have been greater. But, at the same time, harsh words for the *narmasachiva* used by royal servants in *Kāmandaka* indicates his low estimate in their eyes. The low nature of his work, which certainly includes cheap jokes and jesting, evoked such an attitude, but still we find some indication of his importance. Possibly there existed different kinds of *sachivas*. We have reference to *kumārasachiva*[155] in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, *dharmāvatārasachiva* and *amāṭyadharmasya* in a Kalachuri Inscription of 1048-49,[156] and the home-minister (*gṛhamantrī*)[157] and minister in charge of the distribution of betel leaves.[158] The first two are perhaps ministers in charge of princes and religious matters respectively. But we do not know whether other *sachivas* such as *karmasachiva* and *matisachiva*[159] of the earlier period also existed in our time.

(ii) *Civil Administration*:

Like other works on polity our *Purāṇa* regards *amātya* as a constituent of the state. We have seen that in our text they are a cadre of high functionaries from whose ranks *mantrins* and *sachivas* are recruited. Since a single wheel cannot move, the administration cannot be run by the king alone without the help of other officers.[160] So our text advises the king to appoint ministers, the royal priest, the astrologer, the chief queen,[161] etc. and probably other high functionaries called *amātya*. It is obligatory for them to pour different kinds of liquid over the king during the coronation ritual, which shows their high place in the state administrative machinery.[162]

---

[153] *EI*, III, p.30, Bitragunta Grant of Saṁgama (II) S. E.1273 (A. D. 1356).

[154] *KNS*, 5.20: *na narmasachibaiḥ sārdhaṁ kiñchidapyapriyaṃ vadet.*

[155] *Kathās.*, I. 4.30 and 32.

[156] *CII*. IV. No.51, Rewa Stone Inscription of Karṇa: year 800, vv. 34 and 50. v.34—*dvijātireṣā pṛthivīpatīnamamātyadharmasya vabhūva*; v.50—*dharmmāvatārasachivastasmadvāribhavaḥ.*

[157] *Ibid.*, No 67, Rewa Stone Inscription of Vijayasiṁha: year 944 (A. D. 1193). v. 12: *sarvvatra dikṣukhavisarppiyaśaḥ prachaṇḍachedīndraraddi (ḍvī) jayasiṁhagṛhaikamantrī.*

[158] *Ibid.*, v.30: *tāmvū(bū)ladānādhikṛtiprayuktaḥ śrīmajjagatsiṁhasutaḥ sumantrī.*

[159] Sircar, D. C., *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, p. 174, line 17; *Amar.*, II. 8.4.

According to the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali the word *amātya* means one who remains near the king.[163] But we find that in our period Somadeva Sūri[164] defines the term in a different way. He states that those whose prosperity and trouble depend on the success and failure of their duties through the policy of gift and honour are called *amātyas*. In this period emphasis is laid on their policy of making gifts and distributing honours which probably they did on behalf of the king. The term is interpreted in a different way by Śukra,[165] who holds that those who are expert in the knowledge of proper place and time are called *amātya*.

Our *Purāṇa* advises the king to appoint *amātyas* only after ascertaining their qualifications. A thorough examination of their character, antecedents, and qualities is prescribed. It is provided that their watchfulness and proficiency in fine arts should be tested by the king. Lineage and social position are to be enquired into with the help of the spies. The king should judge their efficiency, knowledge, endurance, ingenuity and amiability, and test their eloquence and truthfulness in speech through conversation. Their zeal for work, influence, patience during distress, resolution, loyalty, steadfastness should be observed in peril. Their devotion, friendliness and integrity should be known from their behaviour; their strength, firmness, freedom from disease and character are to be ascertained from those who live with them. In addition to these tests our *Purāṇa* enjoins the king to examine their dumbfoundedness, fickleness, gentility and meanness directly in their presence; on the other hand, the result of their efforts should always be scrutinised in their absence.[166] Thus our text enumerates the positive and negative qualities of the *amātyas* as well as provides the ways to examine them. In all there is nothing new except a repetition of the views of Kauṭilya. The *Agni Purāṇa*, however, does not clearly recommend the examination of *amātyas* through the allurements of religion, wealth, lust and fear, as laid down by Kauṭilya.[167] Nevertheless, in another context, when our *Purāṇa*[168] advises the king to appoint his officers, it prescribes that the pious should be appointed in religious departments, the brave in the department of war, expert persons in the finance department, impotent persons in the harem, and daredevils in difficult tasks. It advises the king to test these officers with the help of his minister (*mantrī*), who should try to find whether the officers are free from allurements. If this is so, they should be posted in those departments in which they are found to be expert. Thus here also our *Purāṇa* follows the *arthaśāstra* tradition[169] although the four allurements and the ways to test the *amātyas* with them are not fully described.

---

[160] *Arth.*, 1.7 ; *Manu*, 7.55 ; *Śukra*, 2.1 ; *NVA*, 18.2-3: *naikasya kāryasiddhirasti, nahyekachakraṁ paribhramati* ; *Yaśas.*, III.3. verse 26: *niyogibhirvinā nāsti rājyaṁ bhūpe hi kevale.*

[161] *Agni*, 218.4.

[162] *Ibid.*, 218.18-20 ; *VDP*, II. 21.8-10 ; *Nītimayūkha*, pp. 18-19 ; *KR*, p. 11 ; *Rājanītiprakāśa*, p. 63.

[163] *HDS*, Vol. III, p. 104 (quoted by the *Mahābhāṣya* from a *kārikā* on Pāṇini).

[164] *NVA*, 18.5: *svakarmotkarṣāpakarṣayordānamānābhyāṁ sampattivipatti yeṣām temātyāḥ.*

[165] *Śukra*, 2.84-86:... *deśakālapravijñātā hyamātya iti kathyate.*

A comparison between our text and its contemporary Jain work the *Nītivākyāmṛta* is very interesting. On the one hand our text and other works on polity lay stress on the positive qualifications of *amātyas*; on the other the *Nītivākyāmṛta* describes only the negative ones. Thus Somadeva Sūri[170] advises the king not to appoint such *amātyas* as are daring, strongly supported (*balavatpakṣa*), corrupt, have weaknesses, are of low descent, incapable of coming back (*aśakyapratyāvartana*), frugal, such as hail from other countries and such as are of very slippery character (*atichikkaṇa*). Further, Somadeva Sūri[171] does not favour the appointment of brāhmaṇas, kṣatriyas, relatives, friends, class fellows of the king, the wicked, allies and the fool. Our text does not lay down any caste qualifications for the *amātyas*, and it is clear from the coronation rituals that they belong to all the four castes.[172]

---

[166] *Agni*, 239.17-23 ; *Arth.*, 1.9 ; *KNS*, 4.34-40.

[167] *Arth.*, 1.9.

[168] *Agni*, 220.11-16 ; *VDP*, II. 24.49-55.

[169] *Arth.*, 1.10.

[170] *NVA*, 18.13.

[171] *Ibid.*, 18.22: *brāhmaṇaḥ kṣatriyaḥ sambandhī nādhi* (*nādhikāriṁ*) *kartavyaḥ.*

[172] *Agni*, 218.18-20 ; *VDP*, II. 21.8-10 ; *Nītimayūkha*, pp.18-19 ; *Śānti.*, (Calcutta Ed., 85.7-10) recommends the appointment of thirty-seven *amātyas*:

But Somadeva Sūri, strangely enough, advises against the appointment of brāhmaṇa and kṣatriya *amātya*. He seems to be suspicious of the caste privilege of the brāhmaṇas and the military character of the kṣatriyas.[173] This injunction against these two higher castes may be attributed to the Jain prejudice against brāhmaṇic privileges and to the progress of trade and commerce in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire. But it is very doubtful whether the advice of Somadeva was actually followed in any part of India at any time.

Our text mentions twenty-five attributes of the *amātyas*, but Bhoja refers to only nine. He makes the acquisition of the knowledge of *dharmaśāstra*, *arthaśāstra* and logic obligatory for them,[174] and lays down that the preceptor, the priest, *amātyas*, ministers, scribes, astrologers, town administrators, commanders of the armies, etc., should be tasted again and again.[175] Thus great care in the selection and appointment of high functionaries of the state on the part of the king is stressed by all ancient texts on polity. It seems from our text that superintendents of various departments are to be selected from the *amātyas*, a fact which is supported by earlier and contemporary sources.[176]

The *Agni Purāṇa*[177] points out eight important functions of the *amātyas* and states that their weaknesses destroy all of them. Thus the *amātyas* are required to deliberate with the king, to take steps for the successful implementation of schemes, to put into effect all the decided works (*kāryānuṣṭhānamāyatiḥ*), to supervise income and expenditure of the state, to look after administration, punishment and reward, to check the enemies of the state, to remove the defects of the state, and finally to protect the king and his kingdom. Thus the *amātyas* are to advise the king and to deliberate with him on all important matters of the state.[178] They are also asked to successfully

---

four learned brāhmaṇas, eight brave kṣatriyas, twenty-one rich vaiśyas, three śūdras and one sūta (mixed caste) well versed in the *Purāṇas*. Here weightage is given to the vaiśyas. This does not occur in the Poona Critical Edn. of the *Mbh.*

[173] *NVA*, 18.22-24.

[174] *Yukti.*, p.3, verse 18: *śānto vinītaḥkuśalaḥ satakulīnaḥ śubhānvitaḥ śāstrārthatattvago'mātyo bhaved bhūmibhujāmiha.*

[175] *Ibid.*, p.2 verse 13.

[176] *Arth.*, 1.10; *Yukti.*, p.11 verse 75 lays down that the *dūtas* should possess qualities of an *amātya.*

[177] 241.16-18.

[178] Cf. *Bārhaspatya-Arthaśāstra*, 6.5: *buddhijīvanairamātyaiḥ sahakāryamakāryam cha nirūpayet.*

execute them to completion. So it is evident that they are to be placed over various executive departments of the state as superintendents (*adhyakṣas*). The king is asked by our text to grant daily interviews in his court to the *amātyas*, who are presented to him by the warder.[179] It is laid down perhaps to give opportunity to the king and his functionaries to make mutual consultations on important matters and to lay down schemes to be executed.

Another important duty of the *amātyas*, as discussed by our *Purāṇa*, is concerned with finance. They are asked to look after the expenditure and income of the state. In other words, they are to collect revenues, apportion them to various schemes, and to see that it is spent rightly without misuse and waste. Somadeva Sūri[180] also lays down four-fold duties, including supervision of finance, for the *amātyas*. According to him they are to enter the reserve fund into registers and properly audit them.[181]

During our period the military functions of the *amātyas* seem to have increased. Our *Purāṇa* instructs the *amātyas* to check the enemies and defend the king and the state. It lays down that the newly consecrated monarch should set out with his *amātyas* for victory over his foes,[182] and refers to wars waged under their leadership.[183] Somadeva Sūri[184] also desires the *amātyas* to sustain the army (*tantrapoṣaṇa*) and protect the royal family. Their growing military power is indicated by contemporary literature and inscriptions. According to Kāmandaka[185] the *amātyas* constitute an integral part of the war-camp (*skandhāvāra*). Someśvaradeva[186] provides for a reward of ten thousand to him who kills a *sachiva* or *amātya*. At another place[187] he advises the king to keep the *sachivas* and *amātyas* in the rear (*prakakṣa*) of the battle-array. Perhaps as war-ministers they were called *sāndhivigrahika* from the Gupta period onwards.[188] Thus we find Vīrasena,[189] a minister of war and peace of Chandra Gupta II, accompanying his master on the military campaign of Mālwa. A highly cultured and valiant family of Kāyasthas, founded by Gollāka, the *amātya* of Yuvarājadeva,[190] served the Kalachuris of Tripurī as *amātyas* for several generations, and may have rendered military service. Vappulla,[191] who seems to be an officer of Karṇa, fought two important battles for his master. A contemporary writer Murāri describes Rama's sieze of Laṅkā after killing commanders and *amātyas* of Rāvaṇa like Prahasta, Dhumrākṣa, Mahodara, etc., in the battlefield.[192] It is just possible that the commander-in-chief, the superintendent of arms and armoury, etc., are to be appointed from the rank of these *amātyas*. We find that our *Purāṇa*[193] advises the king not to participate in actual fighting and to remain at a distance of two miles from the battlefield. This may indicate a shifting of responsibility from the king to his officers and consequently an increase in the powers of these high functionaries.

---

[179] *Agni*, 235.8.

[180] *NVA*, 18.6: *āyo vyayaḥ svāmirakṣā tantrapoṣaṇaṁ chāmātyānāmadhikāraḥ.*

[181] *Ibid.*, 18.53: *nīvīnibandhanapustakagrahaṇapūrvakamāyavyayau viśodhe(ye)t.*

[182] *Agni*, 220.1: *sobhiṣiktaḥ sahāmātyo jayechchhatrūnnṛpottamaḥ,*

[183] *Ibid.*, 236.63· ...*amātyena kṛte raṇe.*

[184] *NVA*, 18.6; 18.11 and 18.12: *tantram chaturaṅgabalam.*

[185] *KNS*, 16.38.

[186] *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.1164.

[187] *Ibid.*, I. 2.1201.

[188] *CA*, p. 343.

[189] *CII*, III, No. 10—Udayagiri Cave Inscription.

Further, the *amātyas* are asked to dispense justice, which seems to be one of their old functions. The *Jātakas*[194] contain many references to *amātyas* being appointed to act as judges and magistrates for examining lawsuits (*vohāra*) and trials (*vinichchaya*). Kauṭilya[195] also entrusts civil and criminal administration to them. It is remarkable that our *Purāṇa*[196] prescribes deterrent punishments for those officers who may be found guilty of extorting money from the people, and those who are not loyal to their duties. It lays down that the *amātyas* and the judges (*prāḍavivāka*) found betraying their duties should be banished from the kingdom, and their property should be escheated.

These four important duties of the *amātyas* are clearly discussed by Somadeva Sūri, who assigns departments of revenue, expenditure, protection of the royal family and the army to them,[197] and lays down that a good *amātya* is one who is liked by the army and the allies, properly supervises the country and the treasury, and above all is devoted to the king.[198] Audit, accounts and registration departments are also entrusted to them.[199] Food and agriculture and manufacture of salt are also placed under their supervision.[200] From the inscriptions of our period, we find that like other high officers of the state, the *amātyas* are informed of the land grants made by the king.[201] Sometimes they are also designated as *rājāmātya*, *kumārāmātya* and *mahākumārāmātya*. They are told of the nature of the grants and instructed not to interfere with the rights of the donee.[202]

---

[190] *Ibid.*, IV, Nos. 38-41.
[191] *Ibid.*, No. 53 Rewa Stone Inscription of Karṇa: Year 812, vv. 9-10.
[192] *Anargharāghava*, VI. verse 16.
[193] 236.33; cf. VDP, II. 177.23-24.
[194] Sharma, R. S., *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India*, Delhi, 1950, p.17.
[195] *Arth.*, 1.10: *tatra dharmopadhāśuddhāndharma sthīyakaṇṭakaśodhaneṣu sthāpayet.*
[196] 227.47-49.
[197] *Supra.*

There is no mention of the *kumārāmātya* or the *rājāmatya* in our text. Here we find only the *mahāmātya*, who is assigned residential quarters in the western sector of the capital along with the treasurer (*koṣapāla*) and the artisans.[203] This may indicate his relationship with the management of finance, trade and industry. Though our text does not speak of the powers of this officer, he seems to be very powerful in our period. In the epigraphic records of the period the *mahāmātyas* are informed of the grants of land.[204] In the lists of high functionaries who are informed of land grants the *mahāmātya* is placed just after the chief minister (*mahāmantrī*) and followed by the royal preceptor, *mahāsāmanta*, *mahāsāndhivigrahika*, etc. In the *Viddhaśālabhañjikā*[205] we find the powerful *mahāmātya* Bhāgurāyaṇa, who may be identified with the brāhmaṇa minister Bhākamiśra of the Kalachuri king Yuvarājadeva I.[206] So the *mahāmātya* seems to be at least a powerful minister. He acted sometimes as the chief minister of the kingdom.[207] In later times, however, the prefix *mahā* did not necessarily denote a high political status. In the Chaulukya administration there were thirty-two departments (*karaṇas*), each under a *mahāmātya*.[208] So here they were no better than superintendents of state departments, and hence had the same status as the *amātyas*. But in our own text the *mahāmātya* means the chief minister or at least the chief executive officer, because we do not come across any other term which may stand for the chief minister.

---

[198] *Yaśas.*, III. 200

[199] *Supra.*

[200] *NVA*, 18.66: *sarvasaṁgraheṣu dhānyasaṃgraho mahān*; 18.69, 18.71: *lavaṇasaṁgrahaḥ sarvarasānāmuttamaḥ.*

[201] *AK*, p. 240 ; Choudhary, R. K., *Select Inscriptions of Bihar*, 1958—*Monghyr* Copperplate of Devapāla (Year 33), line 31.

[202] Chaudhary, R. K., *op. cit.*, Deo-Barnark Inscription of Jīvitagupta II (c A. D. 8th Cent.), Nalanda Copperplate of Dharmapāla, Monghyr Copperplate of Devapāla (year 33), Nalanda Copperplate of Devapāla (year 39), Bhagalpur Copperplate of Nārāyanapāla (year 17), Banagaon Copperplate of Vigrahapāla (year 17).

[203] *Agni*, 106.11.

[204] *CII*, IV, No.50 Gaharwa Plates of Karṇa (A.D. 1047), No.48 Banaras Plates of Karṇa (A.D. 1041), No.56 Khairha Plates of Yasaḥkarṇa (A.D. 1076). No.63 Jabalpur Plates of Jayasiṁha (year 918 = A.D. 1165 or 1166?). In the Gaharawa Plates of Karṇa the *mahāmātya* is preceded by the *mahāsāndhivigrahika* also.

[205] *Viddhaśāla.*, p.143: ... *yathāsamarthayatimahāmātyaḥ.*

Our *Purāṇa* does not prescribe the number of the *amātyas* to be appointed by the king; perhaps it intends to leave it to the king who may take into account the needs of the government. Somadeva Sūri[209] does not favour the appointment of a single *amātya*. He states that the wealth of the kingdom cannot be increased by depending on a single *amātya* as a creeper cannot grow effectively on a tree with a single branch.

According to our text[210] the defects of the *amātya*s are five, laziness, dumbfoundedness, pride, boastfulness and duplicity. Somadeva[211] adds that eating away the state property, carelessness, lack of wisdom, obstruction or delay in works, failure to deposit the state revenue (in the treasury) and monetary transactions are the defects of the *amātyas*. This shows that the *amātyas* had mainly financial duties to perform. Lack of integrity and devotion to duty among the *amātyas* is to be punished with exile according to our *Purāṇa*.[212] We find in the *Yaśastilaka Champū*[213] a vivid description by a spy of the corruption of a *sachiva* (taken as *amātya* here) who is in charge of a province. This may refer to the growth of the power of the *amātyas* and its abuse by them in our period. So Somadeva[214] holds that the king should not trust the *amātyas* and be strict towards them.

---

[206] *CII*, IV, Introduction, p.lxxxiv.

[207] *JBBRAS*, IX, p.219 Ambarnath Inscription of Śāke 782(A.D. 860); *EI*, III, p.267 Bhadana Plates of Sīlara Aparājita, Śāke 919 (A.D. 997).

[208] *Gūrjara Deśa.*, Vol. II, p.411.

[209] *Yaśas.*, III.230: *ekāmātye mahīpāle nālaṁ lakṣmīrvijṛmbhate, latāstatra kā vṛddhiḥ sakhaikā yatra sākhinī.*

[210] *Agni*, 241.26-27.

[211] *NVA*, 18.47: *bhakṣaṇamupekṣaṇaṁ prajñāhīnatvamuparodhaḥ prāptārthāpraveśo dravyavinimayaśchetyamātyādoṣāḥ.*

[212] *Agni*, 227.49.

[213] Book III. chapt. 7.

It seems that in the period represented by the *Agni Purāṇa*, on account of their various functions and growth of their powers the *amātyas* proved a veritable danger to the security of the king and his kingdom. The whole atmosphere during this period seems to have been surcharged with distrust and suspicion. Our *Purāṇa* treats a wicked officer as dangerous as an enemy, fire, poison, a snake and a drawn dagger all combined,[215] and advises the king to keep a constant watch over the officers through a network of spies. It does not trust even the spies. and lays down that the report of a single spy should not be taken on its face value but be accepted by the king only after its proper verification through the report of others.[216] It also enunciates the principle of not doing any harm to one who is not guilty, as any action contrary to this principle may lead to the revolt of the *amātyas* called internal anger (*antaḥ kopa*).[217]

As for the supervision and control of the officers by the king, our *Purāṇa* lays down that the king should take the help of his *amātyas* and other high officers to win over his enemies and to expand his kingdom.[218] He is also enjoined to follow the advice of his ministers.[219] It also advocates the policy of making gifts to them.[220] Besides these, our text recommends a network of spies to observe the activities of the officers without being recognised by them or even by one another.[221] It also states that the king should take the help of his loyal ministers and the superintendents of various departments to find out and control the wicked among them, as a tame elephant is employed to catch the wild ones.[222] It also prescribes deterrents to punish the defaulting officers. It preaches to the king the traditional four-fold policy of love, gift, punishment and dissensions to control his officers. The policy of gift is regarded to be the best of all by our *Purāṇa*.[223] But Somadeva seems to prefer the Kauṭilyan policy of sowing dissensions among the officers.

[214] *Ibid.*, 3.23, 3.196; *NVA*, 18.44.
[215] *Agni*, 220.19-20.
[216] *Ibid.*, 220.22: *naikasya rājā śraddadhyāchchhraddadhyādbahuvākyatah.*
[217] *Ibid.*, 226.11.
[218] *Ibid.*, 220.1; 220.11.
[219] *Ibid.*, 235.12; *VDP*, II. 151.27.
[220] *Ibid.*, 238.19.
[221] *Ibid.*, 220.20-21.
[222] *Ibid.*, 220.15.
[223] *Ibid.*, 226.12: *na so'sti nā(rā)ma dānen vaśago yo na jāyate.*

He states that the mutual quarrels of the officers are an asset to the king.[224] He further informs that the wealth of the officers is the second treasure of the king,[225] which probably implies the prescription of forced loan or heavy taxes from them during emergency. Bṛhaspati[226] advises equal respect for old customs, laws (*dharma*), dependents, *amātyas*, relatives, friends and kinsmen, and asks the king to adopt the policy of peace, dissension and gift to control the *mantrins*, who seem to stand here for the *amātyas* in general. Thus we find that in the period under review, the traditional four-fold policy towards the enemies was now prescribed for the control of the officers and the *amātyas*. The *amātyas* are treated as an enemy, which may be on account of the growth of their power. Nevertheless, Chaṇḍeśvara[227] quotes an old verse which states that the *amātyas* share in the rise and fall of the king; so they should never be disregarded.

Nayachandra Sūri,[228] an early medieval writer, warns the king against the danger of overlooking the faults of his officers who prosper through deceit and recommends step-motherly treatment towards them as against motherly affection towards his subjects. In metaphorical language Somadeva Sūri states that even if there be any possibility of ascertaining the movement of fish in water and of birds in the sky, it is impossible to know the conduct of the *amātyas*, who always foment troubles for the king as a physician tries to rob wealthy patients by aggravating their disease.[229] So we see that the policy of distrust against the officers is suggested by all writers on polity including our own text. It is natural, for in some cases the king's failure to control his haughty and wicked *amātyas* resulted in the loss of his life and kingdom.[230]

---

[224] *NVA*, 18.64: *parasparakalaho niyogiṣu bhūbhujāṁ nidhiḥ.*

[225] *Ibid.*, 18.65: *niyogiṣu lakṣmīḥ kṣitīśvarāṇāṁ dvitīyaḥ kośaḥ.*

[226] *Bārhaspatya-Arthaśāstra*, 1.45, 1.47: *sāmabhedadānāni mantrisu.*

[227] *RR*, p.13: *yeśāṁ rājñā saha syātāmupachayāpachayau dhruvaṁ amātya iti tān rājā nāvamanyetkadāchāna.*

[228] Ghoshal, U. N., *A History of Indian Political Ideas*, 1959, p.451.

[229] *Yaśas.*, III. 3.24-25: *jñāyeta mārgaḥ salile timināṁ patatriṇāṁ vyomni kadāchideṣaḥ, adhyakṣasiddhe'pi kṛtāvalopā na jñāyate'mātyā janasya vṛttiḥ*, etc.

[230] *Gūrjara Desa.*, pp.401 and 487.

According to a legend Karṇa's *mahāmātya* Mādhava, a Nāgara brāhmaṇa, invited Alaud-Din to Gujarat for the destruction of Hindu rule there. The legend is found in the *Prabandhachintāmaṇi, the Vividhatīrtha-Kalpa,* and the *Dharmāraṇya* (A. D. 1300-1450) 67.68-69: *jāto'mātyastasya duṣṭo nirguṇo mādhavāhavayaḥ ...kṣatrarājyasya vidhvaṁso mlechchharājasya sthāpakaḥ.*

The powers and functions of the *amātyas*, laid down in our *Purāṇa*, follow the views of Kauṭilya with the important difference that their military responsibilities are given more weight. We find that, at times, they became very powerful in our period. Important *amātyas* of Yuvarājadeva II placed his son Kokalla II on the throne after his death.[231] So the *amātyas* performed the duty of electing as well as of protecting the people from anarchy, a duty assigned to him by our text. The growth of powers of the *amātyas* or the bureaucracy, in our time, may have undermined royal authority.

The king-designate is asked to nominate the royal priest and the astrologer before he is formally crowned.[232] Our text[233] requires that the royal priest should possess expert knowledge of the *Vedas* (*trayī*) and political science (*daṇḍanīti*) and be able to perform Atharvavedic rituals for the welfare and prosperity of the king. The *Viṣṇudharmottara*, the *Nītivākyāmṛta* and the *Rājanītiratnākara*[234] all devote a full chapter each to the enumeration of the qualifications of the royal priest. A comparison of these qualifications is very interesting. While the *Agni Purāṇa* wants the royal priest to be well-versed in the rituals of the *Atharvaveda*, the *Viṣṇudharmottara*[235] adds the knowledge of the *Yajurveda* to it. Somadeva Sūri[236] states that the priest should be cheerful and of noble birth and character, and possess the knowledge of the *Vedas* with their six-fold branches together with the divine calamities and omens and portents. He reproduces Kauṭilya with little change.[237] Our text is indebted to Kāmandaka, who is quoted by Nīlakaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa and with slight alteration by Someśvaradeva.[238]

The royal priest is asked to ward off the calamities and to increase the king's prosperity through the rituals of the *Atharvaveda*. Like the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, our text[239] devotes separate chapters to the rituals of the four *Vedas*. To remove the calamities is considered to be the chief duty of priest. Following Kāmandaka the *Agni Purāṇa*[240] divides the calamities into two categories, divine and human. Fire, flood, famine, disease and pestilence are called divine, and can be eradicated through human efforts coupled with propitiary rituals. Human calamities are not specified, but according to our text they can be overcome through successful execution of state policies. The propitiary rituals are discussed in great detail in the other chapters of our text,[241] mostly on the line of the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* and the *Viṣṇudharmottara.* They are to be performed by or under the supervision of the royal priest, who helps the king in protecting his subjects. In addition, he is also asked to perform rituals leading to the victory of his king in the battlefield.[242]

---

[231] *CII*, IV, No.56. Khaiarha Plate of Yaśaḥkarṇa: Year 823 (A. D. 1076?); No.57. Jabalpur Plate of Yaśaḥkarṇa: (A. D. 1284); No.63. Jabalpur Plates of Jayasiṁha: Year 918 (A. D. 1165-66).

[232] *Agni*, 218.3.

[233] *Ibid.*, 239.16-17.

[234] *VDP*, II. chapt.5; *NVA*, section II; *RR*, chapt.3.

[235] *Ibid.*, II. 5.2.

[236] *NVA*, 11.1.

[237] *Ibid.*, 11.1; cf. *Arth.*, 1.9.

[238] *Agni*, 239.16-17; *KNS*, 4.32; *Nītimayūkha*, p.72; *Abhilaṣi.*, 1.2.61.

[239] *Ibid.*, chapts. 259-62; *VDP*, II. chapts. 124-127.

The royal priest ranks next to the minister (*mantrin*) and the astrologer, which shows his importance in the governmental hierarchy. The coronation is celebrated under his personal supervision.[243] Moreover, the king seems to perform his daily sacrifices,[244] the annual coronation[245] and worship of gods under his guidance. All this shows that our text expects the royal priest to play a prominent part in the state machinery.

It is interesting to note that the *Mitākṣarā* and the *Vīramitrodaya*[246] include the royal priest among the *amātyas* and enjoin the king that he should follow up his deliberations with other ministers by consultations with the royal priest on all religious and secular matters.[247] Moreover, they quote Kātyāyana[248] and count the priest as a member of the judicial court along with the *prāḍvivāka*, the *amātya*, the brāhmaṇa, etc. It is not clear whether according to our *Purāṇa* the priest participated

[240] *Ibid.*, 241.14-16 ; cf. *KNS,* 13.20-21 ; *Arth.*, 4.3 enumerates eight divine calamities including rats, wild animals, snakes and evil spirits ; *NVA*, 11.3 makes the list still longer.

[241] *Ibid.*, chapts.149, 164 and 263-267 ; cf. *Yāj.*, 1.295-308 ; *VDP,* II, chapts. 128-129, 132-144 ; *Matsya,* chapts. 227-238.

[242] *Ibid.*, chapts. 133-135, 137-236.

[243] *Ibid.*, 218.2.

[244] *Ibid.*, 235.4-5, 235.14.

[245] *Ibid.*, 268.21.

[246] The *Vīramitrodaya* and the *Mitākṣarā* on *Yāj.*, 1.353: *amātyā mantripurohitādayaḥ.*

[247] *Mit.*, on *Yāj.*,1.312-13: *eva mantriṇaḥ pūrvaṁ kṛtvā taḥ sārdhaṁ rājyaṁ sandhivigrahādilakṣaṇaṁ kāryaṁ chintayet samastavyasteścha. anantaraṁ teṣāmabhiprāyaṁ jñātvā sakalasāstrārthavichārakuśalena brāhmaṇena purohitena saha kāryaṁ vichintya,* etc.

[248] *Ibid.*, on *Yāj.*, 2.2, pp.390-91.

in the administration of justice. However, in the Gāhaḍavāla grants[249] the royal priest (*purohita*) occupied the fourth place in the order of precedence among the royal functionaries, the first three places being taken by the chief queen, the crown prince and the *mantrī* (perhaps the chief minister). The importance of the royal priest is shown by his inclusion among the officers, who gave consent to the grants made by the *mahārājaputra* Govindachandra.[250] The *purohita* Jāguka of this grant perhaps became more powerful with land grants made to him.[251] Grants of lands, houses and villages to the royal priest, as advocated by our *Purāṇa*,[252] were actually made during this period.

In addition to the appointment of the chief minister, the royal priest and the royal astrologer, our *Purāṇa* discusses the appointment of important officers of the central government, and provides for the following twenty-one high functionaries :—

(i) commander-in-chief (*senāpati*),
(ii) royal chamberlain (*pratīhāra*),
(iii) ambassadors (*dūta*),
(iv) betel-bearer (*tāmbūladhārī*),
(v) minister for war and peace (*sāndhivigrahika*),
(vi) body guards (*rakṣaka*),
(vii) charioteer (*sārathi*),
(viii) superintendent of royal kitchen (*sūdādhyakṣa* or *paurogavādhyakṣa*),
(ix) members of jury (*sabhāsada*),
(x) scribes (*lekhaka*),
(xi) gate-keeper (*dauvārika*),
(xii) superintendent of treasury (*dhanādhyakṣa*),
(xiii) physician,
(xiv) superintendent of elephants (*gajādhyakṣa*),

---

[249] *EI*, IX, p.305 Chandrāvatī Copper plate grant of Chandradeva and Madanpāla of A. D. 1097-98 ; Choudhary, R. K., *op. cit.*, p.108 Maner Copper plate of Govindachandradeva (*c.* A. D. 1126), 1.12, etc.

[250] *IA*, XIV, pp.101-104.

[251] *EI*, IV, pp.101-103 Kamauli grant (i) (A. D. 1114 ?) ; Kamauli grant (ii) of A. D. 1116 refers to him as the *mahāpurohita* Jāgu Śarman ; Sharma, R. S., "Land Grants to Vassals and Officials in Northern India (*c.* A. D. 1000-1200.)," *JESHO*, IV, Pt. I pp. 70-105.

[252] *Agni*, 218.32.

(xv) superintendent of horses (*aśvādhyakṣa*),
(xvi) superintendent of forts (*durgādhyakṣa*),
(xvii) royal engineer (*sthapati*),
(xviii) teacher for arms and weapons (*astrāchārya*),
(xix) superintendent of harem (*antaḥpurādhyakṣa*),
(xx) superintendent of magazines (*āyudhagārādhyakṣa*), and
(xxi) spies (*chara*).[253]

The present list is a reproduction from the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Matsya*[254]; only two officers, officers in charge of royal mint (*akṣarakṣaka*) and religious affairs (*dharmādhikaraṇa*), mentioned in them are not included here. Scattered references in our text speak of some more officers, who do not find place in the consolidated list given above. We find that the superintendents of the defence department (*balādhyakṣa*), treasurer (*koṣapāla*), chief police officer (*daṇḍanātha*) and the captains of the army (*nāyaka*) are allotted residential quarters in the capital.[255] Besides them we also come across officers checking weights and measures,[256] promulgating the price policy of the king,[257] and examining coins.[258] They are further supplemented by feudal lords,[259] forest officers (*āṭavika*),[260] frontier guards (*sīmāntachārī*),[261] accountants (*gaṇaka*),[262] members of the judicial court (*sabhya*),[263] chief judge (*prāḍavivāka* and *akṣadarśaka*),[264] customs officers (*śaulbika* or *śaulkika*),[265] superintendent of gold (*kanakādhyakṣa*) and the general superintendent (*adhyakṣādhikṛta*).[266] All these seem to belong to the central government. Even the commander of the platoon (*chamūmukhya*),[267] the commander-in-chief (*senānīpramukha*),[268] elephant doctor,[269] soldiers and some lesser important royal servants as *māgadha* and *bandin*[270] are in all probability employed by the king. Our text possibly knows superintendents of many other departments but does not name them.[271]

---

[253] *Agni*, chapt. 220.
[254] *VDP*, II. chapt. 24 ; *Matsya*, chapt. 214.
[255] *Agni*, 106.10-11.
[256] *Ibid.*, 227.60, 258.34.
[257] *Ibid.*, 258.41.
[258] *Ibid.*, 227.60, 258.34-35.
[259] *Ibid.*, 227.53, 241.19-21.
[260] *Ibid.*, 241.62.
[261] *Ibid.*, 241.45.
[262] *Ibid.*, 253.8.
[263] *Ibid.*, 253.32, 362.29.
[264] *Ibid.*, 227.49, 366.3.
[265] *Ibid.*, 257.24.
[266] *Ibid.*, 366.3.
[267] *Ibid.*, 241.62.
[268] *Ibid.*, 351.47.

The *Agni Purāṇa* prescribes the qualifications necessary for the appointment of various officers. The commander-in-chief should either be a *brāhmaṇa* or a kṣatriya. This caste qualification is traditional. The early *Purāṇas* describe the positive qualifications of the commander-in-chief. According to the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Matsya Purāṇa*[272] he should, besides being either a brāhmaṇa or a kṣatriya, be of noble birth, a man of character and be expert in the science of war (*dhanurveda*). He should know the use of elephants and horses and their good and bad qualities. He should be well-versed in the knowledge of omens and portents, use of the six-fold policy of the state and in the art of battle array. Besides these, the commander-in-chief should be grateful, brave, upright (*ṛjuḥ*) and intelligent in deciding what is good and what is worthless. According to the *Garuḍa Purāṇa* the essential requisites of the commander-in-chief are clear understanding of the comparative strength and weaknesses of the army and expert knowledge of the battlefield.[273] This text as well as the contemporary Jain writer Somadeva Sūri leave out the caste qualifications of the commander-in-chief as laid down in the *Smṛti-Purāṇa* literature including our text. Somadeva,[274] however, gives a comprehensive list of the qualifications of the commander-in-chief the most striking of which are the knowledge of the code and language used in war, his popularity among his army and the feudal lords, and his invincible character (*apradhṛṣya*). The *Agni Purāṇa* does not mention the disqualifications of the commander-in-chief, but they are given in detail by Somadeva Sūri. In the 12th century Someśvaradeva[275] lays down seventeen qualifications of the commander-in-chief, mainly on the basis of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Matsya Purāṇa*. A similar discussion regarding the commander-in-chief is found in other works on polity. A comparison between the qualifications of the commander-in-chief (*senāpati*) laid down by the *Agni Purāṇa* and those by some contemporary texts shows two things. First, the *Agni Purāṇa* prescribes the caste of the commander-in-chief but others do not. Secondly, in contrast to other texts his qualifications in the *Agni Purāṇa* are much fewer, which may denote a lessening of the importance of his post. The term *senāpati* came to be used in a general way and stood for a military officer. We do not find the head of the army mentioned among other officers in late Kalachuri grants. Mirashi[276] ascribes it to the possibility of the king acting as commander-in-chief himself. But according to our *Purāṇa*[277] the *senāpati* is in charge of the battlefield, and rewards are provided for those who kill the *senāpati* of the enemy side. However, the decline in his position may be explained by the fact that the *amātyas* and the feudal lords are associated by our *Purāṇa* with war efforts. With the growth of feudalism in our period, the military responsibilities were apparently shifted to the feudal lords, who probably worked under the *amātyas* and the minister for war and peace (*sāndhivigrahika*). Such a practice was obviously dangerous to the stability of the central government.

---

[269] *Ibid.*, 291.14.
[270] *Ibid.*, 366.18.
[271] *Ibid.*, 239.44.
[272] *VDP*, II. 24.8-11. The verses are reproduced with little change by the *Matsya Purāṇa*.
[273] *Garuḍa*, chapt. 112. *Eng. Tr.* p.331.
[274] *NVA*, 12.1-2.
[275] *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.91-93.

Next to the *senāpati* is placed the royal chamberlain (*pratīhāra*), who figures in the state administration from the Gupta period onwards in epigraphic and literary sources.[278] Our *Purāṇa*[279] states that the chamberlain should possess noble birth, knowledge of the political science (*nītiśāstra*) and the (six-fold) policy. These qualifications are broadly laid down by other contemporary writers,[280] one of whom, Viśvarūpāchārya[281] stresses the military qualities of the *pratīhāras*. He lays down that the royal chamberlain should be noble, brave, loyal, immune from disaffection, and possess the knowledge of infantry. The *Agni Purāṇa* does not throw much light on the duties of the *pratīhāras*. According to it the royal chamberlain is asked to introduce ministers and high functionaries (*amātyas*) to the newly-consecrated king,[282] and to arrange for the interviews of high functionaries, ministers, the people, the rich and the illustrious persons with the king in the court.[283] Thus the royal chamberlain is assigned a duty similar to the secretary to the head of the state in modern times.

---

[276] *CII*, IV, Introduction, p.cxliii ; Kahla Plates (No. 74), however, mentions the *mahāsenāpati* among such officers.

[277] *Agni*, 241.3, 241.35.

[278] *CA*, p.343. Bhita seal No. 3 refers to the *pratīhāra*. Basarh seal No. 16 and 18 in Bloch's list refers to the *mahāpratīhāra*.

[279] *Agni*, 220.2.

[280] *VDP*, II. 24.11-12 ; *Matsya*, 214.11 ; *Garuḍa* quoted by the *Rājanītiprakāśa* on p.180: *iṅgitākāratattvajño dhanavān priyadarśanaḥ, apramādī pramāthī cha pratīhāraḥ sa uchyate ; Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.127-128.

[281] Viśvarūpāchārya on *Yāj.*, 1.307: *kulāḍhyaḥ udyukto mṛdurūdattaḥ samarchittaḥ śūro'nurakto'bhedyaḥ pattiviśeṣajña pratihāraḥ.*

[282] *Agni*, 218.31: *amātyasachivādiṁścha pratīhāraḥ pradarśayet* ; *VDP*, II. 21.36-37.

The epigraphs and the literature of our period refer to many other functions of the royal chamberlain i. e. writing land grants and acting as the conveyer (*dūtaka*) of these grants, administering some territorial divisions of the kingdom, defending the king and his kingdom against the enemies, and acting as the liaison officer of the king. All this may be taken as evidence of the growth of power and position of the royal chamberlain. But the *Agni Purāṇa* does not assign these functions to the *pratīhāras*; it places him next to the commander-in-chief and before many other important functionaries, which shows that the *pratīhāra* is a powerful officer. We find the *pratīhāra* Ratnavardhana[284] securing throne for the prince Śaṅkaravarman in A. D. 883. The illustrious Gadādhara,[285] well-versed in science, military science and secret consultation, was promoted from the rank of the *pratīhāra* to the post of the chief minister (*mantrīmukhya*) on account of his grand success against the enemies of his master in the Antarvedi. The *Rāmacharita* informs that the *mahāpratīhāra* Śivarājadeva was assisted in a battle by fourteen feudatories, which gives us an idea of his rank in the Pāla administration.[286] The Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions[287] makes the *pratīhāra* an important royal functionary occupying a fifth position in order of precedence and a position even above the commander-in-chief.

The foregoing discussion of the duties and functions of the royal chamberlain shows that he was a powerful officer attached to the king, and his chief duties lay in taking part in royal coronation, ceremonial and formal introduction of ministers, high functionaries and heads of the guilds and others to the newly-consecrated king, and usher them in to the king's court, or in acting as the royal liaison officer. A successful and efficient execution of his duties might have helped his promotion to a higher rank.

---

[283] *Ibid.*, 235.8; *VDP*, II. 151.17.

[284] *DHNI*, Vol.I, Cal. 1931, p.117; *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, 5.128-129.

[285] *EI*, I, pp.200-206 Mau Inscription of the Chandella king Madanavarmaṇ (*c.* A. D. 1117).

[286] *DHNI*, Vol.I, pp.340-41.

[287] *IA*, XVIII, pp. 19-20; *JASB*. XLII, pp.324-28 Basahi grant of Govindachandra, V.S. 1174 (A. D. 1116 ?); Niyogi, Roma, *History of the Gāhaḍavāla Dynasty*, Calcutta, 1959, p.151.

According to our text[288] the minister for war and peace should be expert in the six-fold policy of the state. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Matsya*[289] add that he should possess knowledge of countries and their languages, knowledge of administration (*naya*), should be able to find out the loyalty and disaffection of the royal servants and to defend the country. They add further that the minister for war and peace should know the income and expenditure, the people and the land of their origin, and should be endowed with beauty, youth, intelligence, firm loyalty and noble birth. Somadeva Sūri[290] provides a still longer list of the qualifications of the minister for war and peace. He adds that he should know grammar and logic, various scripts and languages, the *varṇāśrama* laws, the laws (*vyavahāra*) and usages (*sthiti*), and should be able to analyse things. Further he should be able to read and write fluently.

Our text expects the minister for war and peace to know the six-fold policy of the state, which denotes that he is entrusted with making treaty, advising the king to declare war, etc. We find that Mitraśarman,[291] the *sāndhivigrahika* of Lalitāditya, king of Kāśmīra, is present at the time of drafting the treaty between Lalitāditya and Yaśovarman of Kanauj and objects to recording the latter's name first in the treaty. The conduct of the foreign policy by the minister for war and peace is vividly described by Somadeva in the *Yaśastilaka*,[292] which may reflect the interesting court practices in our time. The epigraphs of our period denote that the *sāndhivigrahika* was a very important officer and was an inditer and writer of the land grants of our period, but nothing is known from our text.

Our *Purāṇa*, as well as the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and *Matsya*,[293] describe the betel-bearer as a high officer. It states that this functionary should be either a man or a woman, fondly attached to the king, sweet in speech and capable of enduring troubles. The other two *Purāṇas* add that he should be above bribery, cruelty and be firmly devoted to the king, probably to prevent poisoning of the king through betel. Anyhow, it is interesting to note that the betel leaf which is so common in Indian life today was first introduced in the early centuries of the Christian era, and became so popular in Gupta and post-Gupta times that we find reference to it in the *Pañchatantra*, the *Suśruta*, the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* of Varāhamihira, the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana, the *Raghuvaṁśa* and the *Amarakośa*. Our text prescribes that the king should take betel-leaf.[294]

---

[288] *Agni*, 220.3.

[289] *VDP*, II. 24.16-17 ; *Matsya*, 214.16.

[290] *NVA*, 32.2 ; cf. *Yaśas.*, III. 250: *vāchayati likhati kavate gamayati sarvālipīścha bhāṣāścha ātmaparasthitikuśalaḥ sapratibhaḥ sandhivigrahī kāryaḥ.*

[291] *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, 4.137-138.

[292] *Yaśas.*, Book III ; cf. Handiqui, K. K., *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, pp. 91-96.

[293] *Agni*, 220.3 ; *VDP*, II. 24.15-16 ; *Matsya*, 214.15: *anāhāryo nṛśaṅsaścha dṛḍhabhaktiścha pārthive, tāmbūladhārī bhavati nārī vāpyatha tadguṇā.*

That the betel-bearer was appointed from both the sexes is supported by the contemporary literature. The betel-bearer is called *tāmbūladāyaka*,[295] *tāmbūlavāka*,[296] *tāmbūladhara*,[297] *tāmbūlādhikāra*,[298] *tāmbūlavāhaka* and also *tāmbūlavāhinī*.[299] They are different from the *tāmbūlika*,[300] who perhaps sold betel-leaf to the people. Someśvaradeva[301] also mentions the betel-bearer as a devoted and faithful officer. Alberuni[302] mentions the practice of chewing betel-leaf. Our text attaches great importance to this and prescribes four days of the week, Sunday, Monday, Wednesday and Thursday and only the *mūla* asterism for chewing it first.[303]

The post of the betel-bearer seems to be important in early medieval times. It is mentioned in the works of polity,[304] and at least in one inscription,[305] which refers to the appointment of Jagatasiṁha, a man of the minister's rank, to the post of the distributor of betels. He got excavated a tank on behalf of the government costing fifteen hundred

---

294 *Ibid*. 235.15 ; *NVA*, 25.60, etc.

295 *Pañchatantra*, III. 67-68 *tāmbūlavāhaka* ; *Kāmasūtra*, 12.46.

296 *Harṣacharita*, IV, para 34, p.144.

297 *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, 8.1738.

298 *Pañchatantra*, I. 10.2-3.

299 *Harṣacharita*, VIII, para 21, p.252 ; *Kādambarī*, para, 100.

300 *Kādambarī*, para, 85.

301 *Abhilaṣi*., III. 11.1282 *tāmbūladhāriṇo bhaktā*.

302 *Alberuni's India*. Vol.II, p.152 ; Elliot and Dowson, *Early Arab Georgaphers*, pp. 94-95. Rashid-ud Din on the basis of Alberuni writes 'the whole country produces the pan, in consequences of which Indians find it easy to live there, for they are ready to spend their whole wealth upon that leaf.'

303 *Agni*, 121.11..

304 Majumdar and Altekar, *The Vākūṭaka-Gupta Age*, 1946, p.353 ; *Abhilaṣi*., III. 11.1282 ; *Rājadharmakāṇḍa*, p.26 ; *Rājanītiprakāśa*, p. 181.

305 *CII*, IV, No. 67. Rewa Stone Inscription of Vijayasiṁha : Year 944 (A. D. 1193) vv. 30-31 and v.41.

ṭaṅkakas, gave charities and even commanded the army of his master. It is interesting that a powerful minister is appointed as the distributor of betels. The appointment of the distributors of betel-leaf in the court of the Gurjara-Pratīhāra can be inferred from the fact that the king of Kanauj used to honour the scholars with two betels and a seat.[306] Anyhow, the betel-bearer or the distributor of betels seems to be in constant attendence on the king, which perhaps enhanced his power and position.

The *Agni Purāṇa*[307] lays down that the king should appoint envoys (*dūtas*), who are sweet-tongued, strong and forceful, It adds that the envoys should possess intelligence, retentive memory, oratory, experience and knowledge of arms as well as of scriptures.[308] Similar qualifications are laid down by the other *Purāṇas*,[309] the earlier texts[310] and the contemporary literature.[311] Our *Purāṇa* makes the knowledge of arms and weapons necessary for the envoys which is done only by Kāmandaka and not any other authority. However, the *Agni Purāṇa* does not state several other attributes such as knowledge of making peace and war, loyalty, integrity, ability to reproduce any statement, noble birth, and the knowledge of the topography of the country and ability to judge opportune time and place, as is done by other texts. Our text does not point out what may be regarded as weaknesses in the envoys, which we find in the *Udyogaparva* and in the *Nītivākyāmṛta*.[312] The late digest writers, however, quote the views of Manu, Kāmandaka, the *Matsya* and the *Garuḍa Purāṇa* on the qualifications of envoys but not from our text.[313]

[306] *Naiṣadhīyacharitam*, XXII. 153: *tāmbūladvyamāsanaṁ cha labhte yaḥ kānyakubjeśvarāt*, etc. Even to-day the general practice is to take two betels at a time.

[307] 220.2.

[308] *Ibid.*, 241.7-8.

[309] *VDP*, II. 24.12-14; Same verses are reproduced by the *Matsya*, 214.12-13; *Garuḍa*, Eng. Tr., Calcutta, 1908, p. 331.

[310] *Arth.*, 1.16; *Manu*, 7.65-68; *Śānti.*, 85.28; *KNS*, 12.2.

[311] Viśvarūpāchārya on *Yāj.*, 1.307; *NVA*, 13.2; *Yaśas.*, III. 111.

[312] The *Udyogaparva quoted in the History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. III, p. 127 describes eight essential qualifications of the envoys—four positive and four negative. According to it, the envoys should not be dumbfounded, impotent, dilatory and liable to be bribed, but instead they should be kind, amiable, free from diseases, and liberal in speech. The NVA (13.2) enumerates personal weaknesses and foolishness as disqualifications in an envoy.

[313] *Rājadharmakāṇḍa*, p.25 quotes the *Matsya*: *Nītimayūkha*, p. 89 quotes Kāmandaka; *RR*, p.42 quotes Manu; *Rājanītiprakāśa*, p. 180 quotes the *Matsya* and the *Garuḍa*.

The caste and sex qualifications of the envoys do not find place in the *Agni Purāṇa*. But according to Somadeva[314] even a barber could act as an envoy. Chaṇḍeśvara[315] contemplates even a *mlechchha* as envoy. However, preference is generally given to the brāhmaṇas.[316] Somadeva Sūri states that lady messengers should be employed in dealing with women.[317]

Our text[318] repeats the old classification of the envoys into three categories—the *nisṛṣṭārtha*, the *mitārtha* and the *śāsanahāraka*. This classification recurs with some change in the *Mitākṣarā*, the *Nītivākyāmṛta* and the *Nītimayūkha*.[319] Our *Purāṇa*[320] states that each of the succeeding type of the ambassadors is one fourth less in qualities than the preceding one. The *Mitākṣarā* on the *Yājñavalkya*[321] is perhaps the earliest authority to clearly explain the three varieties of the *dūtas*. It states that the *nisṛṣṭārtha* are those who are vested with full powers and possess abilities to plead the case of the king with due consideration of time and place. Thus they may be compared with the ambassadors plenipotentiary of modern times. The second type of the ambassadors enjoys limited powers and scope. They are to speak only on assignments entrusted to them like the present envoy. The third category of the ambassadors is required only to carry the king's letters and messages to the other king. Besides this differentiation of the ranks of the envoys our *Purāṇa*[322] states that an ambassador is an open spy in foreign lands as opposed to the secret spies (*charas*), who work underground and help the ambassadors in their mission. The comparison of the envoys with open spies reflects the secret nature of their duties.

Our *Purāṇa* states that the envoys should not enter the town or the court (*saṁsad*) of the enemies without proper verification. They should wait for the opportune time to engage themselves vigorously in their mission. They are also required to know beforehand the loopholes of the enemies, their relative strength and weakness in matters of treasury, allies and army, and the loyalty and the disaffection of the people. The *Agni Purāṇa* advises the envoys to praise both sides in four ways and to seek the assistance of their spies,[323] but it does not specify the four methods. Perhaps they are expected to study the mind of the king and the people of other countries. So the duties of an ambassador are to gather secretly all information of the country to which they are sent and to pass them on to his king so that it may facilitate the execution of his future policies towards that country. Compared to these duties of the ambassadors laid down in our text, the list provided by Somadeva Sūri[324] is more detailed and definite. However, our text depicts the envoys as playing an important role in the formulation of inter-state relations. During our period the *dūta* seems to be a permanent officer at least in the government of Jīvitagupta II[325] and the Pālas.[326]

---

[314] *NVA*, 13-19 *teṣāmantyāvasāyino(chaṇḍāla)'pyavadhyāḥ kimaṅga punarbrāhmaṇaḥ*.

[315] *Rājanītiratnākara*, p.42: *dūto melechchho'pyavadhyaḥ syādrājā dūtamukho yataḥ*.

[316] *NVA*, 13.19; *Yaśas.*, III. 111.

[317] *Ibid.*, 24.26: *strīṇāṁ dautyaṁ striya eva kuryuḥ*; 13.22.

[318] 241.8 ; cf. *Arth.*, 1.16 ; *KNS*, 12.3

[319] *Mitākṣarā* on *Yāj.*, 1.328 replaces *mitārtha* with *sandiṣṭārtha* ; *NVA*, 13.3 ; *Nītimayūkha*, p. 89.

[320] *Agni*, 241.8

[321] *Mitākṣarā* on *Yāj.*, 1.328: *tatra nisṛṣṭārthā rājakāryāṇi deśakālochitāni svayameva kathayituṁ kṣamāḥ Uktamātraṁ ye parasmai nivedayanti te sandiṣṭārthāḥ. Śāsanaharāstu rājalekhaārinaḥ*.

[322] *Ibid.*, 241.12: *charaḥ prakāśo dūtaḥ syāt* . . . cf. *KNS*, 12.32.

Our *Purāṇa*[327] dwells upon the qualifications of various other officers of the king, but does not lay down their duties, which can be inferred only from their name. Thus it ordains that the guards (*rakṣaka*) should be equipped with swords, the charioteers should possess the knowledge of the army, the superintendent of royal kitchen (*sūdādhyakṣa*) should be expert in culinary work; the members of the jury (*sabhāsada*) should be expert in laws, the scribes (*lekhaka*) should know the various scripts, and the door-keeper (*dauvārika*) should know the opportune time to call a person to the king's presence. Similarly it adds that those who know the qualities and defects of jewels should be appointed as superintendent of riches (*dhanādhyakṣa*) and should be given all financial posts. It further lays down that the royal physician should acquire the knowledge of the *Āyurveda*.

The *Agni Purāṇa* also provides for the appointment of superintendents of various other departments such as superintendent of horses, superintendent of elephants, superintendent of forts, superintendent of harem, etc. They are expected to be expert in sciences and knowledge relating to their respective departments. The engineer (*sthapati*) and teachers for imparting military science and superintendents of magazines also find place in the *Agni Purāṇa*, which discusses the varieties, the good and bad qualities of men and women as well as of various jewels,[328] horse,[329] elephant,[330] swords,[331] and dwells on the science of architecture,[332] sculpture,[333] military science,[334] etc. But it does not deal with culinary art, which is elaborately discussed by Someśvaradeva.[335]

---

[323] *Agni*, 241.9-12 : cf. *KNS*, 12.6-13. It (12.11) also explains the four means with which to praise i.e. result, name, money and illustrious works.

[324] *NVA*, 13-18 ; *Yaśas*, III, 115.

[325] Choudhary, R. K. *op. cit.*, p.31 Deo-Barnark Inscription of Jīvitagupta II (*c.* A. D. 8th cent.).

[326] *AK*, p.242.

[327] *Agni*, 220.4-10.

Our text, like Kāmandaka,[336] prescribes the age limit for officers employed in the harem and lays down that the superintendent of harem should be either a man of over seventy or a woman of over fifty years. This is provided perhaps to protect the chastity of the queen, etc., and to keep them free from disaffection and intrigues. It seems that the *Agni Purāṇa* thinks of many superintendents of other departments as well as the superintendent of army (*balādhyakṣa*),[337] superintendent of gold (*kanakādhyakṣa*) and the general superintendent of administration (*adhyakṣādhikṛta*),[338] and avers that the king should appoint industrious persons as superintendent of all the various departments.[339]

It seems that our work thinks of a well-knit espionage system under the superintendent of spies (*charādhyakṣa*).[340] It declares that the spies are the eyes of the king, who should appoint them in such a way that they may not be recognised by the people and even by one another. They should keep an eye over the strength and weaknesses of other kings in the garb of merchants, physicians, astrologers and mendicants. It shows that these types of persons were popular in contemporary society. Our *Purāṇa* cautions the king against placing undue reliance on the report of a single spy.[341] Spies are required to help the envoys of their country in foreign kingdoms.

---

[328] *Ibid.*, chapts., 224-246.

[329] *Ibid.*, chapts. 288-290.

[330] *Ibid.*, chapts.287 and 291.

[331] *Ibid.*, chapt.245.

[332] *Ibid.*, chapts.104-106 and 247.

[333] *Ibid.*, chapts.39-53, etc.

[334] *Ibid.*, chapts. 249-252.

[335] *Abhilaṣi.*, III. 13.1523-1781.

[336] *Agni*, 220.9; KNS, 7.44. It prescribes an age of eighty years for a man in the harem.

[337] *Ibid.*, 106.10.

[338] *Ibid.*, 336.3.

[339] *Ibid.*, 239.44: *kuryādudyogasaṁpannānadhyakṣānsarvakarmasu.*

[340] *Ibid.*, 221.3; cf. *VDP*, II. 25.9 uses '*dhanādhyakṣa*' while *Matsya*, 215.9 reads '*janādhyakṣa*.'

The institution of secret espionage finds favour with our *Purāṇa* and other works on polity. But a new provision in our text is of the post of the superintendent of spies, not mentioned even by the *Arthaśāstra* which provides for the longest number of superintendents. It seems that the spies, who were under the direct charge of the king under the Mauryas, ceased to remain in that position though we find the king consulting his spies daily.[342] The *Agni Purāṇa*, however, does not throw much light on the working of the espionage system, which, on the lines of Kauṭilya, is found in the *Nītivākyāmṛta*[343] and the *Yaśastilaka*.[344] The first enunciates the principles, and the second shows their actual working. The spy of Yaśodhara roams in the garb of a mendicant. He reports to the king the corrupt methods of his wicked ministers. Somadeva adds that kings who do not try to know their own situation and that of others through spies are divested of wealth and life by their officers and enemies.[345] The appointment of the superintendent of spies is supported by Somadeva. He refers to a chief of the spies called Variṣṭhaka, who announces the arrival of the spy coming back from his mission.[346] He also speaks of the chief of the emissaries (*jaṅghāchārikanāyaka*).[347] So it seems that espionage system was organised under one superintendent in our period.

Our text prescribes the code of conduct and etiquette to be followed by the king's servants in a separate chapter. The relation between the king and his servants is said to be similar to that existing between the teacher and the taught or between the husband and the wife. In other words, servants are asked to be submissive to the king and to identify their interests with those of the king. They are warned against disobeying royal commands, speaking unpleasant words to the king, appropriating royal funds and showing disrespect to him. They are also asked neither to imitate the dress and speech of the king nor to divulge the king's secrets or to publicise them. Yawning, spitting, coughing, etc., in the presence of the king are considered bad manners. They are advised to rise above dishonesty, greed, parsimoniousness, atheism, meanness and changeableness. They are asked to cultivate learning and crafts, to serve the king, to increase the prosperity of the people and to show proper respect to the prince, the royal favourites and the minister. But at the same time they are cautioned against communicating the secrets of the king to the officers, though pressed by them and against putting trust in the ministers (*sachivas*). Thus our *Purāṇa* does not put any trust in the high officers of the realm. The royal servants are advised to speak to the king only when asked for, to stand with him in times of peril, to enquire after the welfare of the king and to offer seat to him. They are asked to attend to the king's command, and to rejoice even when chastised or given small remuneration. They are neither permitted to enter the royal chamber without the permission of the king nor to visit him at an improper place. Our text advises them to wear dress, ornaments and gems given to them by the king. Similar but more detailed discussions on the code of conduct for royal servants are found in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Matsya Purāṇa*.[348]

---

[341] *Ibid.*, 220.20-22 ; *VDP*, II. 2466-67 ; *Matsya*, 214.91-96.

[342] *Ibid.*, 235.2.

[343] *NVA*, chapt.14.

[344] *Yaśas.*, Book III.

[345] *Ibid.*, III. 3.117: *chārasaṁchārato yeṣāṁ nādhyakṣā svaparasthitiḥ, niyuktārātisaṁpātātteśāṃ nārtho na chāsavaḥ.*

[346] *Ibid.*, p. 400: *janaśrutimādāyāgataḥ śaṅkhanakanāmā praṇidhiriti gūḍhapuruṣādhiṣṭhādvariṣṭhakādākarṇya..*

[347] *Ibid.*, p. 404, Śrutasāgara explains the term as head of the spies (*charapuruṣapradhāna*).

The *Agni Purāṇa*, like the post-Mauryan law-books, uses the term *sāmanta* in the sense of a neighbouring proprietor of a land.[349] But it is only a reminiscent of old ideas. We have seen that the synonyms offered for the king by our *Purāṇa* such as *aśeṣasāmanta, maṇḍaleśvara, adhīśvara, rājarājeśvara*, etc. suggest the existence of a feudal hierarchy in the state.[350] We can glean something about the growth of feudalism or at least of the feudatories belonging to the priestly class. The *Agni Purāṇa*[351] devotes six chapters to the enumeration of various gifts to be given to the priests and brāhmaṇas in general. It states that gifts of gold, land, and a girl of eight years are the best.[352] It prescribes the grant of house, cow, buffalo, gold, silver, precious gems, iron, copper, etc., to the brāhmaṇas which can increase their economic prosperity.[353] Gifts of land are also enjoined, but remarkably enough we do not find any reference to the widely practised system of granting fallow and uncultivable (*khila* and *aprahata*) land, or the principle of *bhūmi-*

---

[348] *Matsya*, chapt.215 ; *VDP*, II. chapt. 25.
[349] *Agni*, 257.1-3 ; *Manu*, 8.262-263 ; *Yāj.*, 2.150-152.
[350] *Supra*, pp. 34-35.
[351] Chapts. 208-213.
[352] *Ibid.*, 211.37: *hāṭakakṣitigaurīṇāṁ saptajanmānugaṁ phalaṁ.*
[353] *Ibid.*, 211.18, etc.

chhidranyāya or the *avanirandhranyāya;*[354] on the other hand the *Agni Purāṇa* proposes the giving away of land with standing crops as well as fertile land capable of producing all crops.[355] Our text lays down that one should give away bullock, ten ploughs with bullocks, bullock-carts, grain as well as male and female slaves.[356] The brāhmaṇas are also to be provided with reservoirs of water.[357] All such gifts together with the implements made from the iron made over to the brāhmaṇas[358] were meant to be utilised by them for their agricultural pursuits. Besides the gifts of fertile and scattered pieces of land our *Purāṇa* also suggests the transfer of proprietory rights over mountainous villages (*kharvaṭa*), villages with agricultural peasants (*kheṭaka*) and even towns (*pura*) to the brāhmaṇas.[359] The terms '*dadāti*', '*datvā*', '*dadat*', etc., used for making these gifts by our text point out to the transfer of all the rights of ownership by the donor to the donee. So we have references to the grant of fertile lands and villages with all the peasants and the tillers of the soil attached to the land. The transfer of land with all the persons attached to it can be compared to the benefices given to the church in medieval Europe. The peasants so transferred are evidently supposed to furnish manual labour and other services to their new masters. It is difficult for a single donee to cultivate the land of the whole village or the town, and peasants acting as their tenants or sub-tenants have to be provided.

The *Agni Purāṇa* repeats the verse, often quoted in the land grants of the Gupta and post-Gupta period, which threatens the king with damning consequences if he appropriates the land and wealth granted to the brāhmaṇas and temples.[360] Constructing temples and monasteries (*maṭhas*), providing them with lands, slaves, arranging for dance and music[361] and recital of holy scriptures[362] therein and consecrating and depositing books in the *maṭhas*, all go to suggest the rise and development of famous and rich monasteries in the early medieval period. The lands belonging to these temples and monasteries are either to be tilled by semi-serfs or given to the peasants for cultivation. This also helped the growth of feudalism in our period. The regular process of land grants to brāhmaṇas, temples and monasteries led to the rise of feudatories belonging to the priestly class. Gifts of settled villages and towns cannot be ordinarily made by an ordinary or private person, but by the king or the government. As the brāhmaṇas are declared to be tax-free[363] they are not expected to contribute any tax for their land or village to the government. It acted as a great drain on the economic resources of the state.

---

[354] Sharma, R. S., *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India*, pp.218-219.

[355] *Agni*, 211.34: ... *sasyaśālinaṁ* ; *Ibid.*, 213.9: *bhūmiṁ dattvā sarvabhākṣyātsarvasasya prarohiṇīm.*

[356] *Ibid.*, 211.6: *saṁyuktahalapaṅktyākhyaṃ dānaṃ sarvaphalapradam, paṅktirdaśahalāproktā dārūjā vṛṣasaṁyutā* ; *Ibid.* 211.72 *dāsīdāsamalaṃkāraṁ* ... ; 212. 5, 209. 41, 211.40-41: *śakaṭaṁ vṛṣasaṁ yuktaṁ datvā* ...

[357] *Ibid.*, 209.43.

[358] *Ibid.*, 211.22.

[359] *Ibid.*, 211.34: *kharvaṭaṁ khetakaṁ vā'pi grāmaṁ vā sasyaśālinam, nivartanaśataṁ vā'pi tadardhaṁ vā gṛhādikam* ; *Ibid.*, 213.9: *grāmaṁ vā'tha puraṁ vā'pi kheṭakaṁ cha dadatsukhī.*

[360] *Ibid.*, 22.14-16.

Furthermore, the *Agni Purāṇa* eulogises the gift of camel, horse, elephant, chariots, and other conveyances.[364] It also provides for a gift of weapons and other war materials to them.[365] So we find loss of the royal monopoly over horse and elephant, which in the opinion of Sharma helped the growth of feudatories in the Gupta period.[366] With the gift of arms and weapons together with other warheads the brāhmaṇa feudatories may be expected to be transformed into a warrior class. The royal priest, as a result of these grants, seems to maintain a large number of elephants. Kāmandaka[367] suggests to the king to maintain record of the elephants and horses belonging to the royal priest (*purohita*) and high functionaries (*mahāmātras*). According to our text the king loses his rights to the arms, weapons and conveyances captured in the battlefield.[368] The *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Nītiprakāśikā* authorise the king to receive many articles as his share in the spoils of war, but the *Agni Purāṇa* allots him only precious stones. It is just possible that war materials captured in the war are intended for the warriors taking part in it.

Our text is perhaps the first to define the duties of the feudatories

---

[361] *Ibid.*, 211.72, 222.13-14

[362] *Ibid.*, 211.53-62.

[363] *Ibid.*, 223.30.

[364] *Ibid.*, 209.23 ; 211.38,72 ; 318.22, etc.

[365] *Ibid.*, 209.48 : *raṇopakaraṇaṁ śastraṁ dhvajādyaṁ sarvadaivatam*, cf. *VDP*, III. 301.27.

[366] Sharma, R. S., *op. cit.*, pp. 213-15.

[367] *KNS*, 12.44.

[368] *Agni*, 236.63 ; cf. *VDP*, II. 177.85 ; *NP*, 6.103-104.

(*sāmantas*), although the *Harṣacharita* of Bāṇa also sheds some light on this. According to the *Agni Purāṇa* the *sāmantas* are assigned some functions relating to the fort, as described in the *Kāmandaka*.[369] They are enjoined to appease public feeling, to help their overlord in war, to gather together his (overlord's) allies and auxiliaries, and to distinguish friends from disguised enemies. They are also required to protect the people (*janatrāṇam*) evidently like a fort, a function hitherto performed by the king.[370] It seems that the feudatories provided elephants, cavalry and infantry to the king.[371] We have literary as well as epigraphic references to the participation of the feudal militia (*sāmantapatti*) on behalf of the king in battles.[372] We have numerous examples of feudatories helping their overlord in their military pursuits in the early medieval period.[373] We find the enumeration of fourteen *sāmantas* assisting their overlord Rāmapāla, Rāmapāla could utilise their services only when he travelled to the principalities of his *sāmantachakra* and of the forest chiefs, to win them over to his cause, and only when he distributed wealth amongst them and granted them land with unstinted generosity.[374]

The *Agni Purāṇa* states that the functions of the feudatories (including the protection of the people and participation in battles fought by the king) cannot be performed if they are disaffected.[375] Their revolt is considered to be external danger (*bāhyakopa*) as against the internal danger posed by the disaffection of the prince, ministers, high functionaries and such other persons.[376] Apprehending the danger posed by them, the *Agni Purāṇa* instructs the king to destroy a rebellious and disloyal feudatory.[377] All this shows that feudatories were thought to be sufficiently important by our text.

---

[369] *Ibid.*, 241.20-21 ; *KNS*, 13.28-29.

[370] Dutt, M. N., *Eng. Tr.* Vol. II, p:865.

[371] Sharma, R. S., *op. cit.*, p. 213.

[372] *EI*, VI, pp. 1-12, Aihole Inscription, verse 23: *sāmantasenā mukuṭamaṇi mayūkhākrānta pādāravindaḥ.*

[373] *CII*, IV, No. 45 Bilhāri Stone Inscription of Yuvarājadeva II verse 59: *atha sa vihitakṛtyaśchedināthaḥ samarthaḥ karituraga samagraḥ śaktasāmantapattiḥ. diśimatiśayaramyāṁ sampratasthe pratīchī . . .*; Bandyopadhyaya, N. C., *Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories*, Part II, pp.265-266.

[374] *DHNI*, Vol. I, pp. 340-341.

[375] *Agni*, 241.21.

[376] *Ibid.*, 226.11.

[377] *Ibid.*, 227.53: *rāṣṭreṣu rāṣṭrādhikṛtānsāmantānpāpinoharet.*

(*iii*) *Judicial Administration*

An important duty of the king, according to our *Purāṇa*, is adjudication of civil and criminal cases.[378] The administration of justice is held as an important and sacred duty by all writers on polity.[379] The rod of justice or the punishment is the basis of everything (in society), and destroys unsocial elements. The *Agni Purāṇa* states that in its absence the balance of society is lost, and everyone tends to cross his limits.[380] It adds that punishment is called *daṇḍa* as it helps the virtuous to follow the established rule of society and compels the crooked to leave their crookedness. Moreover, it destroys the desperadoes.[381] So the *Agni Purāṇa* stresses the importance of the coercive power of the government in maintaining social stability. A similar view is held by *smṛtis* and Someśvaradeva.[382]

The *daṇḍa*, according to the late *Purāṇas*, is of two types, one for internal and the other for external application. The first includes criminal administration. As an important branch of administration, the *Agni Purāṇa* devotes one of its chapters on *rājadharma* to the enumeration of seventy-one crimes and the punishment thereof.[383] But here no attempt is made to define law, its various branches, the different points of litigations, the constitution of courts, the procedural methods, etc. Our text refers to these topics in its six chapters on *vyavahāra*.[384] The treatment of judicial administration under both *rājadharma* and *vyavahāra* sections denotes that it is probably based on two different sources.

The *vyavahāra*, according to the *Agni Purāṇa*, enables us to know what is just and what is unjust;[385] in other words it lets us have an idea of the legality of any action. This meaning of the term is new. Other texts ascribe different senses to it; it means any transaction according to the *Udyogaparva*, a dispute or a lawsuit according to Manu, Vasiṣṭha, Yājñavalkya, Nārada and the *Śāntiparva*. The third meaning allotted to it is the legal capacity to enter into transaction; it is also the 'means of deciding a matter.'[386] However, our *Purāṇa's* definition of *vyavahāra* seems to be a developed form of the fourth. Our text does not take it in a restricted sense, as is done by some medieval digest writers,[387] but discusses the lawsuits as well as legal procedure (*vyavahāramātṛkā*) under it.

---

[378] *Ibid.*, 227.1: *daṇḍapraṇayanam vakṣye yena rājñaḥ parā gatiḥ.*

[379] *Manu*, 8.1; *Yāj.*, 1.327; *Nārada*, 1.2; *Mit.*, on *Yāj.*, 2.1; *NVA*, 27.1; *NP*, 8. 22; *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2. 1244; etc.

[380] *Agni*, 226.14-16; cf. *Manu*, 8.128; *Vṛddhahārita*, 4.186.

[381] *Ibid.*, 226.14.

[382] *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2. 1295-1297.

[383] *Agni*, chapt. 227.

[384] *Ibid.*, chapt.253-258.

[385] *Ibid.*, 253.1: *vyavahāraṁ pravakṣyāmi nayānayavivekadam.*

The *Agni Purāṇa* defines legal suit as an action contrary to the rules of *smṛtis* and good conduct, and brought before the court by persons other than the king and his officers.[388] This view is in keeping with Manu and Yājñavalkya.[389] In our time Someśvaradeva[390] repeats the same principle. The compiler of our text tries to make compromise between its two sources, the law-books of Yājñavalkya and Nārada. Yājñavalkya does not favour the initiation of lawsuit by the government, but Nārada states that lawsuits under the miscellaneous (*prakīrṇaka*)[391] group rest on the king. The *Agni Purāṇa* declares that such lawsuits are bereft of shelter (initiator)[392]. However, as the king is expected to provide shelter to those without it, it implies that the king should initiate such cases, though rarely. So we find that our *Purāṇa* favours the institution of legal suits by private parties but does not exclude the possibility of their initiation by the government if they relate to the violation of royal orders. Cases relating to the breaking of royal orders and their non-implementation are covered by the term *nirāśraya* (without shelter) and not by the term *nṛpāśraya* (to be initiated by the king) as in the *Nārada Smṛti*. It either shows carelessness on the part of the copyist or a general decrease in the royal power and prestige. Furthermore, our *Purāṇa* does not differentiate between civil and criminal laws and justice as we find in the *Arthaśāstra*.[393] However, it enjoins consideration of litigation relating to violence, theft, defamation and assault, killing of a cow, abuse, sinful acts and adultery on the very day of complaint, although other cases may be adjourned for hearing at any other time as desired (by the judges or the parties concerned).[394] These seem to constitute criminal acts which require immediate judicial probing, and courts trying such cases may be roughly compared with the session courts of modern times. Our *Purāṇa* closely follows Yājñavalkya,[395] who is more rational than Nārada,[396] for the latter includes disputes relating to land and gold also in the list of emergent cases.

---

[386] *HDS*, Vol.III, pp.245-248.

[387] Chaṇḍeśvara, Jīmūtavāhana, Raghunandana, etc. take it to mean judicial procedure only.

[388] Cf. *Vyavahāranirṇaya* of Varadarāja, and *Vyavahāramayūkha* of Nīlakaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa.

[389] *Agni*, 253.35.

[390] *Manu*, 8.43 and *Yāj*., 2.5.

[391] *Abhilaṣi*., I. 2. 1265 and 1275: *svayaṁ notpadyetkāryamarthārthīpṛthivīpatiḥ*.

[392] *Agni*, 253.30: *prakīrṇakaḥ punarjñeyo vyavahāro nirāśrayaḥ*.

[393] *Arth*., Book 4.

Our text states that laws have four feet or sources, scriptures (*dharma*), customs (*vyavahāra*), usages and precedents (*charita*), and royal writs (*rājaśāsana*). These are the same as enumerated by Nārada. But Nārada holds that each later one of four is incompatible (*purvabādhaka*)[397] with the preceding one, while the *Agni Purāṇa* calls them complimentary (*purvasādhaka*).[398] So according to Nārada royal writ can override all the other three sources of law, but according to our text it enjoys the same validity as the three other sources of law. Such a view denotes a general lessening of the importance of royal writs and the king's authority.

As for the relative importance of the various sources of state law the *Agni Purāṇa* repeats a verse of the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti*, which lays down that in the event of conflict between two *smṛtis* equity based on usages (*vyavahāra*) should be preferred, and when a conflict arises between the *dharmaśāstra* and the *arthaśāstra*, the first will prevail upon the second. Ghoshal points out that the importance of this verse is twofold, its acceptance of the *arthaśāstra* as a source of law, and the overriding effect of king's decision over canonical rules.[399]

Our *Purāṇa* catalogues the old eighteen branches[400] of litigation termed as 'the eighteen legs of lawsuits'. So a legal suit arises out of any of the following causes, debt, breach of trust, partnership, resumption of gifts, non-rendition of services, non-payment of wages, sale of a thing by one who is not the rightful owner, non-delivery of sold goods, purchase, regulation of religious sects and corporations, land, adultery, partition, criminal acts, blasphemy, assault, gambling and prize-fighting, and some miscellaneous causes.[401]

---

[394] *Agni*, 253.41-42: *sāhasasteyapārūṣye(gobhi)ṣvabhiśāpātyaye striyāḥ,*
vichārayetsadya eva kālo'nyatrechchhayā smṛtaḥ.

[395] *Yāj.*, 2.12.

[396] 1.39: *gobhūhiraṇyastrīsteya . . . sadya eva vivādayet.*

[397] *Ibid.*, 1.10.

[398] *Agni*, 253.3-4.

[399] Ghoshal, U. N., *A History of Indian Political Ideas*, pp.161-62.

[400] The variant noted in the footnote, rather than found in the general body of the text, is correct.

It further states that these titles of litigation have a hundred sub-branches, caused by the difference in the nature and behaviour of the people.[402] This seems to be an approximate number of sub-heads as it may change from time to time, place to place and man to man. Nārada[403] limits the number of sub-titles of litigation to one hundred and thirty-two. A similar enumeration of the eighteen branches of litigation has been made by Manu[404] and Nārada,[405] but our *Purāṇa* closely follows the latter. Apparently the recognised sources of litigation tend to increase in early medieval period. They are nineteen according to Bṛhaspati quoted in the *Smṛtichandrikā*,[406] twenty in the *Mitākṣarā*[407] on the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* and twenty-two according to Someśvaradeva.[408] But there is nothing new in these increased lists except splitting an old title of litigation into two or more sub-heads.

According to our text administration of justice constitutes an important part of the king's daily routine and it precedes even his consultations with ministers.[409] The king is enjoined to adjudicate law-suits in his court in the forenoon. He is asked to enter the court well dressed with ornaments on his body.[410] This advice goes against Manu,[411] who prescribes simple and modest dress. The king is further urged to see the brāhmaṇas, high functionaries, ministers and the general people, who are ushered in by the warder (*pratīhāra*).[412] The first three of these people together with the king seem to form the highest court of justice. This constitution of the court is supported by Kātyāyana[413] and the *Nītiprakāśikā* ;[414] Kātyāyana, however, enlarges the court by including the chief justice (*prāḍvivāka*), the royal priest and the jurors (*sabhyas*) in it. The *Agni Purāṇa* states that the judicial bench is to be assisted by respectable persons, an accountant and a scribe. It adds that the brāhmaṇas constituting the court should be learned and free from anger; and the assessors should be expert in Vedic literature (*śrutivedin*) and free from attachments, prejudices, fear and greed.[415] It adds that the king should depute a brāhmaṇa with assessors to look into lawsuits if he is himself unable to do so on account of heavy pressure of other works.[416] However, it does not fix any number of the members of the court, or of the assessors, as is done earlier by Manu and in our time by Someśvaradeva.[417] Similarly it does not introduce any caste consideration in the appointment of the trying magistrates (*prāḍvivāka*) and the jurors, as is done by Kātyāyana,[418] the *Mitākṣarā*,[419] the *Nītiprakāsikā*[420] and the *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi*.[421] All these authorities vehementally oppose the appointment of a śūdra either as a judge or a juror. The absence of such a categorical injunction in our text may denote a somewhat liberal policy towards the śūdras. Here the attitude of the compiler of our text is consistent with his recommendation for the appointment of śūdras as high functionaries (*amātya*) of the state.[422]

---

[401] *Agni*, 253.13-30.
[402] *Ibid.*, 253-31.
[403] *HDS*, Vol.III, p.262.
[404] 8.4-7.
[405] 1.16-19.
[406] Vol. II, p.9.
[407] The colophon given at the end of the chapter dealing with *vyavahāra*.
[408] *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.1266-1274.
[409] *Agni*, 235.9 ; 253.32.
[410] *Ibid.*, 235.6-7 ; The *NP* (8.14) holds a similar view.
[411] 8.2: *vinītaveṣābharaṇaḥ* . . .
[412] *Agni*, 235.7-9.
[413] Quoted by the *Mit.* on the *Yāj.*, 2.2.

The *Agni Purāṇa* admits twofold evidence, human and divine. Written documents (*likhita pramāṇa*), actual possession (*bhukti*) and witnesses constitute the first ; and ordeals by scale, water, fire, poison and consecrated water (*koṣa*) come under the second type of proofs.[423] It lays down the method of writing a document of debt.[424] A similar procedure is perhaps expected to be followed in other cases. It states that such documents should be written in the presence of at least three witnesses,[425] and if they are illegibly written, lost, grown faint, stolen, destroyed, burnt or if they are in another country, they are to be replaced by a fresh one.[426] The verse of the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* regarding a title to moveable and immoveable property arising out of illegal possession for ten and twenty years respectively is reproduced here.[427] Our text holds that a title is stronger than possession which is not hereditary, but if it is not backed by even slight enjoyment it has no strength.[428] It quotes a verse to be found only in the text of Viśvarūpāchārya's *Yājñavalkya smṛti* and not in the *Mitākṣarā*, which together with the *Vyavahāramayūkha* ascribes this to Nārada.[429] The verse in question states that actual enjoyment of property backed by a rightful title is valid in law. The *Agni Purāṇa* adds that only the original trespasser is to be prosecuted and not his son or grandson as in this case enjoyment is more valid ; if the trespasser is dead, property illegally seized by him should be recovered from his possessions because enjoyment of property without any legal right does not entitle him to it.[430] These two preceding statements of our *Purāṇa* are contradictory ; they probably mean that both title and actual possession of a thing are interdependent.

---

[414] *NP*, 8.22.

[415] *Agni*, 253.32.

[416] *Ibid.*, 253.33: *apaśyatā kāryavaśātsabhyairvipraṁ niyojayet.*

[417] *Manu.*, (8.10) favours the appointment of three, but Someśvaradeva (*Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2. 1249-50) states that three, five or seven brāhmaṇas should be appointed as assessors.

[418] Quoted by the *Mit.* on *Yāj.*, 2.3.

[419] Same as above.

[420] 8.16.

[421] I. 2.1261-1263.

[422] *Agni*, 218.20.

[423] *Ibid.*, 253.50-51, 255. 28-48 ; *Yāj.* 2.22,2.95-112.

[424] *Ibid.*, 255. 16-23.

The requisite qualifications of a witness, and his disqualifications, are discussed at some length in the *Agni Purāṇa*,[431] which makes two new points not found in the law-book of Yājñavalkya. First, Yājñavalkya and some earlier lawgivers insist that at least three witnesses should testify to a fact,[432] whereas our text states that they should be either five or three.[433] It adds, that, if well-versed in scriptures (*dharma*),[434] the witnesses may also be two or even one. Secondly, unlike Yājñavalkya and Nārada, it permits all persons to depose evidence in case the legal suit relates to theft, blasphemy and assault, and criminal acts.[435] Kātyāyana expresses a similar view to the effect that in cases relating to criminal acts, robbery, adultery, and defamation and assault all persons (including all incompetant witnesses) can depose their evidence.[436] However, our text provides a list of seventeen types of persons including women, the old, the infant, heretics, etc., who are ordinarily debarred from acting as witnesses.[437] It also repeats the old *smṛti* rule that the witnesses should belong to the caste of the party concerned.[438]

---

[425] *Ibid.*, 255.19.
[426] *Ibid.*, 255.24.
[427] *Ibid.*, 253.52-54 ; *Yāj.*, 2.24.
[428] *Ibid.*, 253.55-56.
[429] *Ibid.*, 253.56-57 ; *Yāj.*, (TSS) 2. 29 ; *Mit.*, on *Yāj.*, 2.27 and 2. 29 ; *Vyavahāramayūkha*, p.19: *āgamena viśuddhena... prāmāṇyaṁ nādhigachchhati.*
[430] *Ibid.*, 253.57-59.
[431] *Ibid.*, 255.1-4.
[432] *Yāj.*, 2.69 ; *Manu*, 8.60 ; *Nārada*, *ṛṇadāna*, 130 ; etc.
[433] *Agni*, 255.2 ...*sākṣiṇaḥ pañcha vā trayaḥ.*
[434] *Ibid.*, 255.5 ; same as *Yāj.*. 2.72.
[435] *Ibid.*, 255.4: *asākṣiṇaḥ sarvasākṣye chauryapāruṣya sāhase.*

Ordeals according to our text, should be resorted to when other proofs are wanting.[439] The same opinion is held by Yājñavalkya,[440] Nārada, Bṛhaspati, Kātyāyana, Pitāmaha[441] and Someśvaradeva.[442] Our *Purāṇa* lays down that ordeals should be gone through when disputes relate to high treason, grave sins, or amounts of great value.[443] It adds that ordeals of fire, balance and poison should not be administered for such litigation as involves an amount less than a thousand *paṇas*.[444] Furthermore, it states that ordeal of balance should be administered in disputes of over one thousand *paṇas* whereas an ordeal of consecrated water (*koṣa*) should be used when the suit involves only fifty *paṇas*.[445] The divine ordeal of balance is prescribed for a brāhmaṇa, a woman, a minor, the old, the blind, the crippled and the diseased; the fire ordeal for a kṣatriya, the water ordeal for a vaiśya and the ordeal of poison for a śūdra.[446] Thus divine ordeals vary from caste to caste, and some mildness is shown to the weak and the infirm. These are to be performed in the presence of the king and the brāhmaṇas.[447] Our text discusses the procedure of these ordeals at some length.[448] Abundance of technical[449] as well as general literary evidence,[450] accounts of Hsüan

[436] Quoted by Aparārka, pp.670-71; *Smṛtichandrikā*, Vol.II, p.79.

[437] *Agni*, 255.3-4.

[438] *Ibid.*, 255.2.

[439] *Ibid.*, 253.51.

[440] 2.22.

[441] *HDS*, Vol.III, p.363.

[442] *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.1284-86.

[443] *Agni*, 255.28.

[444] *Ibid.*, 255.30. But this rule is not obligatory in case of an injury done to the king.

[445] *Ibid.*, 255.31.

[446] *Ibid.*, 255.31 and 33.

[447] *Ibid.*, 255.32; *Yāj.*, 2.97.

[448] *Ibid.*, 255.34-49.

[449] Various *smṛtis*, digests and commentaries such as the *Mitākṣarā*, the *Smṛtichandrikā*, the *Divyatattva* of Raghunandana, the *Vyavahāramayūkha* of Nīlakaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa, *Vyavahāraprakāśa* of Mitramiśra, etc.

[450] *Mṛchchhakaṭika*, IX. 43.

Tsang[451] and Alberuni[452] together with epigraphic evidence[453] show that ordeals were employed in the adjudication of litigation till modern times.

For litigation of little credence our text prescribes divine oath to be performed with truthful speech, conveyance, weapons, cow, seeds of grain, gold, the holy feet of preceptor, and images of god.[454] It may also be done through charitable and pious deeds. It seems that the *Agni Purāṇa* here summarises the view of Śaṅkha and Bṛhaspati.[455] Somadeva Sūri prescribes different oaths for people of different castes and different economic avocations.[456]

According to the *Agni Purāṇa* crimes such as assault on a brāhmaṇa by a śūdra,[457] theft,[458] abetment to theft and help to thieves,[459] murder and atrocities,[460] adultery in the reverse order of *varṇas*,[461] destruction of a house, forest, field, village and pastures,[462] encroachment on a public tank or a temple,[463] poisoning,[464] seducing the queen,[465] revolt by the governors or feudatories[466] and above all the false prosecution by a procurator of a king's court[467] are to be punished with capital punishment. Similarly it prescribes amputation of limbs for assault on a kṣatriya by a śūdra,[468] mischief done by low castes to their superiors,[469] abusing a brāhmaṇa or passing urine, wind, etc., in his presence,[470] sitting on a high seat in front of a brāhmaṇa,[471] repetition of robberies,[472] adultery in the reverse order of *varṇas* on the part of a woman,[473] prejury, stealing, counterfeiting coins, theft of gold, selling of impure meats,[474] blasphemy against the king, preaching sedition, chastising one's preceptor or divulging the secrets of his spells and advice,[475] mutilating a dead body,[476] and any hostile action against royal orders.[477]

---

[451] Beal, S., *Travels of Hiouen-Thsang*, Vol.II, pp.139-40.
[452] *Alberuni's India*, Vol.II, pp.158-160.
[453] *HDS*, Vol.III, pp.376-378.
[454] *Agni*, 255.49-50.
[455] Quoted by the *Vīramitrodaya* on *Yāj.*, 2.113.
[456] *NVA*, 27.30-37.
[457] *Agni*, 227.50-51.
[458] *Ibid.*, 227.53-54, 258.59.
[459] *Ibid.*, 227.52.
[460] *Ibid.*, 258.62.
[461] *Ibid.*, 258.69.
[462] *Ibid.*, 227.62, 258.67 (through fire).
[463] *Ibid.*, 227.54.
[464] *Ibid.*, 258.65.
[465] *Ibid.*, 227.36, 227.63, 258.67.
[466] *Ibid.*, 227.53.
[467] *Ibid.*, 227.66.
[468] *Ibid.*, 227.25.
[469] *Ibid.*, 227.29.
[470] *Ibid.*, 227.30.
[471] *Ibid.*, 227.31.
[472] *Ibid.*, 258.63.

The following nineteen crimes, according to the *Agni Purāṇa*, are to be punished with the highest amercement:—

(i) giving away a married girl in marriage again,[478]
(ii) insulting a man of superior caste,[479]
(iii) fraud,[480]
(iv) trade in contraband articles,[481]
(v) brāhmaṇas taking prohibited meals,[482]
(vi) seducing another's wife,[483]
(vii) villifying a brāhmaṇa or the king,[484]
(viii) joint action to break one's neck, thigh, arm or to pluck out eyes,[485]
(ix) cutting the genitals of higher animals,[486]
(x) counterfeiting coins, weights and measures, and dealing with the manufacturer of these things,[487]
(xi) false pretension of being a physician to royal officers,[488]
(xii) unjust imprisonment, letting of criminals and helping the undertrials to escape from jail,[489]
(xiii) strike by artisans or serious interference with the business of the employer,[490]

---

[473] *Ibid.*, 258.69.
[474] *Ibid.*, 227.36, 258.75-76.
[475] *Ibid.*, 258.78-79.
[476] *Ibid.*, 258.78.
[477] *Ibid.*, 258.80.
[478] *Ibid.*, 227.16-17.
[479] *Ibid.*, 227.27.
[480] *Ibid.*, 227.57-58.
[481] *Ibid.*, 227.57-58.
[482] *Ibid.*, 227.60, 258-75.
[483] *Ibid.*, 227.64, 258.74.
[484] *Ibid.*, 258.8.
[485] *Ibid.*, 258.18.
[486] *Ibid.*, 258.24.
[487] *Ibid.*, 227.60-61, 258.34.
[488] *Ibid.*, 258.36.
[489] *Ibid.*, 258.37. The term *abadhyaṁ* and *badhyaṁ* in this verse should read as *abandhya* and *bandhya* as in the Mit. on *Yāj.*, 2.243.
[490] *Ibid.*, 258.40.

(xiv) omission and addition in a royal edict,

(xv) sitting on a royal seat or conveyance,[491]

(xvi) killing thieves through fire, water, incantations, etc.,[492]

(xvii) destroying a foetus through weapons,[493]

(xviii) killing a woman accidentally,[494]

(xix) adultery with a woman of his own caste, and dragging her by hair.[495]

Crimes carrying a punishment of middle amercement, according to our text, are such as:—

(i) dispossessing a man of his house, tank, garden and field by threat,[496]

(ii) false preaching of the doctrines of *smṛtis*,[497]

(iii) insulting a man of high caste through arrogance (*pramāda*) or for a fun,[498]

(iv) failure to perform one's part of an agreement to a contract,[499]

(v) adulteration of goods or sale of such articles,[500]

(vi) claim by a defeated person of not being defeated,[501]

(vii) false complaint against a person leading to his social ostracism,[502]

(viii) abusing one's relation (*jñātipūga*),[503]

(ix) breaking hands, feet, nose and teeth, causing grievous hurt. bruising one's wound and cutting away ears and nose,[504]

(x) breaking neck, arm, thigh, and plucking out eyes of another person or of impairing the organs of locomotion, digestion or speech,[505]

(xi) abetting the throwing of a fatal or injurious substance in the house of another,[506]

---

[491] *Ibid.*, 227.63-64 ; 258.74 cf. 258. 79.
[492] *Ibid.*, 258.63-64.
[493] *Ibid.*, 258. 64.
[494] *Ibid.*. 258.65.
[495] *Ibid.*, 258.68.
[496] *Ibid.*, 227.22-23.
[497] *Ibid.*, 227.26.
[498] *Ibid.*, 227.27.
[499] *Ibid.*, 227.56.
[500] *Ibid.*, 227.57.
[501] *Ibid.*, 227.65, 258.81.
[502] *Ibid.*, 258.7.
[503] *Ibid.*, 258.8.
[504] *Ibid.*, 258.16.
[505] *Ibid.*, 258.17.
[506] *Ibid.*, 258.22 ; cf. Yāj., 2.224.

(xii) cutting the genitals of lower animals,[507]
(xiii) adultery with members of inferior caste,[508]
(xiv) sexual intercourse with degraded woman and cow.[509]
(xv) riding a royal seat or conveyance,[510]
(xvi) pretension of being a doctor of the people,[511]
(xvii) letting loose horned or fanged animals, which cause injury to others,[512] and
(xviii) calling an honest person a thief.[513]

Accusing people falsely of minor sins,[514] speaking ill of one's country or native village,[515] uplifting a brāhmaṇa from the ground,[516] passing spurious coins as genuine by assay-master,[517] pretending to be a veterinary physician,[518] letting loose one's horned cattle,[519] destroying boundaries,[520] and committing adultery by a brāhmaṇa with a vaiśya girl, a kṣatriya with a śūdra or degraded caste girl[521] are to be punished with the first amercement.

The *Agni Purāṇa* prescribes a judicial fine of six hundred *paṇas* for returning or taking back sold or purchased articles and for selling of an article to another person for more profit.[522] A fine of two hundred *paṇas* is laid down for knowingly supressing the defects of the bridegroom, encroachment on the house, tank and garden of another person unkowingly, assult on a brāhmaṇa by a vaiśya, and gossip with a forbidden woman.[523]

Similarly neglect on the part of the tender of the cattle,[524] assault on a brāhmaṇa by a kṣatriya,[525] causing insult to parents, elder brother, father-in-law, elders, and preceptors, and obstructing their passage,[526] forcible dragging or tying a man with cloth,[527] visit to a widow of easy virtues, assault on a man seeking shelter, and without reason, touching the body of a brāhmaṇa by a chāṇḍāla, participation in the meal prepared on the occasion of ancestral or divine *śrāddha* of a religious mendicant by a śūdra, an improper oath together with the performance of a work in spite of all prohibitions and by one who is incompetant, and depriving a tree of fruit-bearing capacity, castration of a lower animal, misappropriation of public property, and destruction of the foetus begotten on a female slave are punished with a fine of a hundred *paṇas*.[528] The same punishment is prescribed for deserting one's relations not in any way degraded in society,[529] non-observance of mutual relations in times of emergency,[530] taking away the cover of the waist, breast, umbilicus or the braided hair of the woman or exposing them to public,[531] woman's talk with a forbidden person,[532] and unnatural intercourse with beasts.[533] Petty crimes such as committing nuisance on the road, taking prohibited eatables by a śūdra and roughly handling a lower animal or cutting one portion of its body are to be fined one or two *karṣāpaṇas*.[534]

---

[507] *Ibid.*, 258,24.
[508] *Ibid.*, 258.68.
[509] *Ibid.*, 258.71.
[510] *Ibid.*, 258.79 ; cf. *Yāj.*, 2.227.
[511] *Ibid.*, 258.36.
[512] *Ibid.*, 258.76-77.
[513] *Ibid.*, 258.77 ; cf. *Yāj.*, 2.301.
[514] *Ibid.*, 258.7.
[515] *Ibid.*, 258.8.
[516] *Ibid.*, 258.12.
[517] *Ibid.*, 258.35.
[518] *Ibid.*, 258.36.
[519] *Ibid.*, 258.76-77.
[520] *Ibid.*, 227.22.
[521] *Ibid.*, 227.43-44.
[522] *Ibid.*, 227.15 ; 227.18.
[523] *Ibid.*, 227.15-16, 227.21-22 and 23, 258.70.
[524] *Ibid.*, 227.18-19.

The *Agni Purāṇa* prescribes the shaving of the head of a woman defiled by one of her superior caste, and provides for branding a man with the female organ for defiling the chastity of a woman and his branding with wine-bowl on the forehead for drinking wine.[535] It also lays down that a thief should be asked to carry a dog on his shoulders and a murderer of a brāhmaṇa a skull on the top of a rod.[536] Such punishments are intended to cause disgrace and humiliation to the criminals in public.

Chapters on law and judicial administration in the *Agni Purāṇa*

---

525 *Ibid.*, 227.23.
526 *Ibid.*, 227.28.
527 *Ibid.*, 258.14.
528 *Ibid.*, 258.29-31 ; cf. *Yāj.*, 2.234-236.
529 *Ibid.*, 258.32.
530 Same as above.
531 *Ibid.*, 258.69-70.
532 *Ibid.*, 258.70.
533 *Ibid.*, 258.71.
534 *Ibid.*, 227.55, 227. 60.
535 *Ibid.*, 227.43.
536 *Ibid.*, 227.50.

reveal some important facts. First, the definition of law, its sources, and the various titles of litigation are based on the *Nārada Smṛti*; but the procedural law, the law of evidence, matters of litigation and punishments prescribed thereof are based on the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and especially the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti*. The text of Yājñavalkya preserved in the *Agni Purāṇa* is intermediate between the text of Viśvarūpa and that of the *Mitākṣarā*. Kane holds that the *Agni Purāṇa* agrees with Viśvarūpāchārya but 'in a far larger number of cases agrees with the readings of the *Mitākṣarā*.' Some readings of Viśvarūpāchārya adopted by our text seem important when we compare them with that of the *Mitākṣarā*. Thus it prescribes a fine of twenty-two *paṇas* for using false weights and measures, and the punishment of first and middle amercement for the assay-master for accepting spurious coins as genuine and *vice-versa*, and for using royal seat and conveyance respectively,[537] but the *Mitākṣara* lays down a fine of two hundred *paṇas* and highest amercement for these crimes.

Second, the laws and judicial administration seem to be caste-ridden, preference being given to the brāhmaṇas. The brāhmaṇas on the one hand are punished lightly in comparison with other castes; on the other they are expected to maintain a high level of social morality in their private life and are more drastically punished for laxity in it. For example, we find that for taking prohibited food a śūdra is fined only one *karṣāpaṇa* when a brāhmaṇa is fined one thousand *paṇas*.[538]

Third, some regulations prescribed by our text are meant perhaps to protect joint-family system and to afford protection to the cattle wealth, trees, ponds, gardens and forests. These are necessary for a predominantly agricultural economy and the patriarchal society of the period with which we are dealing.

Fourth, crimes committed under the influence of liquor or insanity are not recognised as cognizable offence.[539] Thus the intention behind crime and not the crime itself is punished.

Fifth, the abetment of crime is regarded as more heinous than the crime itself. Throwing a fatal or injurious substance in the house of another and performing rash or a violent deed are punished respectively with a fine of sixteen *paṇas* and eighty *paṇas*, whereas an abetment of these crimes is punished with middle amercement and one hundred and sixty *paṇas* respectively.[540] Similarly, a repetition of crime is more harshly dealt with.

---

[537] *Ibid.*, 258.38 ; cf. Yāj. (*Mit.*), 2.244. *Ibid.*, (*Vis.*), 2.251 ; *Agni*. 258.35 ; cf. *Yāj.* (*Mit.*), 2. 241 *Ibid.* (*Vis.*) 247 ; *Agni*. 258.79, cf. *Yāj.*, 2.303; *Ibid.*, (*Viś.*) 2.306.

[538] *Agni*, 227.60 ; cf. *VDP*, II. 72.176.

[539] *Ibid.* 258.11 : *mohamadādibhiradaṇḍanam.*

Sixth, no undue consideration is shown to high officers, trying magistrates and even the king. Neglect of duty, corruption, and above all an unwanted harassment of the people by them are severely punished. Officers charged for these offences get the highest amercement, and they are to be banished from the country their property being escheated to the royal treasury.[541] Compared to the view of Manu, the punishment suggested for these crimes by our *Purāṇa* is more deterrent. Manu lays down a fine of one thousand *paṇas* only.[542] Somadeva Sūri states that a sojourn in another country is troublesome for a king what to talk of others.[543] Our text asks the king to refund thirty times an unjust fine imposed on an innocent person.[544]

Seventh, the *Agni Purāṇa* repeats the view of Nārada that a judicious administration of justice confers seven benefits: piety, wealth, fame, popularity among the people, respectability, firm hold on the people, and above all a permanent abode in heaven.[545]

Eighth, we find that our text prescribes life-imprisonment to a śūdra for assaulting a brāhmaṇa,[546] and imprisonment for one month for stealing the public rope or the pot kept on a well, diverting wrongfully the water into another channel and for showing cruelty to animals.[547] We have references to the jailor (*bandhanapālaka*)[548] and punishment of officers helping the escape of a prisoner from jail or judicial custody. However, the list of crimes and punishment thereof contained in our *Purāṇa* suggests that confinement in jail is rarely practised. Monetary fines are more important than other system of punishments. Besides, we find that our text does not suggest the construction of a jail-building in its planning for the capital, as it is done by Kauṭilya. Even the *Smṛtis* of our period do not generally prescribe imprisonment.[549]

---

540 *Ibid.*, 258.22, 258.26.
541 *Ibid.*, 227.47-49.
542 *Manu*, 9.234.
543 *NVA*, 26.65.
544 *Agni*, 258.82 ; *Yāj.*, 1.307.
545 *Ibid.*, 258.83 ; same as *Nārada*, 1.26-27.
546 *Ibid.*, 258.23 ; cf. *Manu*, 8.264.
547 *Ibid.*, 227.34-35.
548 *Ibid.*, 230.3.
549 Monetary judicial fine seems to constitute a regular source of state's income.

Ninth, the *Agni Purāṇa*[550] defines monetary fines of first, middle and highest amercement as equal to two hundred and fifty, five hundred, and one thousand *paṇas* respectively. Here it repeats the view of the *Viṣṇudharmasūtra*,[551] the *Manu Smṛti*[552] and the *Viṣṇudharmottara*.[553] A slightly different definition is provided by Yājñavalkya.[554] According to him one should be fined two hundred and seventy, five hundred and forty, and one thousand and eighty for first, middle and highest amercement respectively. Śaṅkha-Likhita[555] states that first amercement means a fine ranging from twenty-four *paṇas* to ninety-one, middle amercement from two hundred to five hundred, and the highest amercement from six hundred to one thousand *paṇas*. Nārada[556] lays down the lowest limits of these amercements as one hundred, five hundred and one thousand *paṇas*. The view of our *Purāṇa* is accepted by Someśvaradeva[557] which shows that this definition was still current in the period of our review.

Lastly, the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* enjoins the king to review such cases as are not judiciously examined,[558] but the *Agni Purāṇa* does not. Yājñavalkya therefore shows that final appeal is to be heard by the king, a point supported by the contemporary writer Somadeva Sūri,[559] who states that an appeal against the decision of village and town-courts may be filed with the king and a decision on such appeals by him will be final and irrevocable. It is strange that the *Agni Purāṇa* does not speak of any other court lower than the king-in-council.

(iv) *Local Administration*

The *Agni Purāṇa* thinks in terms of a kingdom divided into many smaller administrative units, such as *rāṣṭra*,[560] *janapada*,[561]

[550] 227.4-5.

[551] *HDS*, Vol.III, p.394.

[552] *Manu*, 8.138.

[553] II. 72.5.

[554] 1.366.

[555] Quoted by *Vivādaratnākara*, Bib. Ind., Calcutta, 1931, p.670 and *Daṇḍaviveka*, p.23.

[556] *HDS*, Vol.III, p.394. The text of the *Nārada Smṛti* in the *Smrti-Saṁdarbha*, Vol.I, however, does not lay down the lowest financial limit of the highest amercement, which, according to it, means capital punishment, escheat of property, banishment, branding and excision of limbs. (*Nārada, Sāhasa.*, vv.6-7.)

[557] *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.1292-3.

[558] *Yāj.*, 2.305: *durdṛṣṭāṅstu punardṛṣṭvā vyavahārānnṛpeṇa tu,*

[559] *NVA*, 27.22-23.

[560] *Agni*, 227.53, 239.2.

[561] *Ibid.*, 239.27.

deśa,[562] *viṣaya*[563] and *maṇḍala*.[564] They seem to have been divided into smaller units, for our *Purāṇa* provides for a hierarchy of officers, on the basis of earlier *Purāṇa-Smṛti* texts, for one village, for groups of ten, hundred and even more villages, and for a *viṣaya*.[565] Besides, we have references to the existence of towns (*nagara*), area of half the town (*kheṭaka*) and the mountainous villages (*kharvaṭa*).[566]

It seems that our text uses the term *janapada* not in the sense of an administrative unit of the kingdom but in the sense of the kingdom itself. While giving royal genealogies of the past it refers to various *janapadas* such as Gāndhāra, Kerala, Choḷa, Pāṇḍya, Kola, Kaikeya, Bhadraka, Aṅga, Vaṅga, Puṇḍra and Kaliṅga.[567] They stand perhaps for independent countries of the past and remind us of the famous *ṣoḍasa mahājanapadas* of the 6th century B.C. The *janapada* is described as one of the seven constituents of the state, and so it stands for the territory of the whole kingdom.[568]

The *rāṣṭra*, at some places, stands for the whole territory,[569] but at the same time it seems to be an administrative division of the country under the *rāṣṭrādhikṛta*.[570] This officer may be compared to the *rāṣṭra-pāla*[571] of the *Arthaśāstra*, the *rāṣṭrādhipati*[572] of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *rāṣṭrapati* or the *rāṣṭrakūṭa* of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa administration.[573] Our text shows that the head of the *rāṣṭra* is to be helped by a council, the membership, the numerical strength, the power and jurisdiction of which is not described. The council is called the *rāṣṭrapālikā*. The members of this council are enjoined to actively participate in the installation ceremony of the image of a god.[574] At least one epigraph of our period the Añjaneri Plates of Bhogaśakti of K. E. 461 (A.D. 709-10 or 710-11) informs us that the king Bhogaśakti asked the five or ten merchants (who were evidently elected as representatives of the town) to celebrate the annual *yātrā* festival of the god for a fortnight in the month of Mārgaśīrsa.[575] These representatives were to look after the service and property of the god and were allowed to enjoy some economic privileges in return. The inscription shows that the members of the council either in the *rāṣṭra*, town or the village are elected, and their number is either five or ten; they also participate in public functions. Our text lays down that the king should kill the heads of the *rāṣṭra* who are sinful.[576]

---

[562] *Ibid.*, 260.27, 260.47.

[563] *Ibid.*, 13.14, 223.1, 212.23.

[564] *Ibid.*, 212.23.

[565] *Ibid.*, 223.1-4 : *Manu*, 7.115-7 ; *Viṣṇudharmasūtra*, 3.7-14 ; *Śānti.*, 87, 3ff ; *NP*, 8.46-48 ; *VDP*, II. 61.1-6 ; *Abhilaṣi.*, II. 2.160-63.

[566] *Ibid.*, 211.34, 213.9.

[567] *Ibid.*, 277.3, 277.9, 277.11.

[568] *Ibid.*, 225.11, 233.12, 239.27.

[569] *Ibid.*, 223.7, 225.31-32, 239.2, etc.

[570] *Ibid.*, 227.53.

[571] *Arth.*, 5.1.

[572] *VDP*, II. 72.153.

[573] Altekar, A. S., *Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their times*, Poona, 1934, p.175.

[574] *Agni*, 68.14. M. N. Dutt wrongly translates the *rāṣṭrapālikāḥ* as royal officers (*Eng. Tr.*, p.246).

The other administrative division is *deśa* under the *deśasvāmī*. The rituals regarding the construction of temple and the consecration of the image of god contain a prayer to the earth, which states that it is jointly owned by the lord of the *deśa*, the chief of the town (*purasvāmī*) and the owner of the house (*gṛhasvāmī*).[577] This prayer refers to the proprietory right of these officers over the land. We find this territorial division in the Gupta period,[578] and it seems to continue in our own. Someśvaradeva, who provides us with a comprehensive list of royal officers, refers to the officer in charge of the *deśa* (*deśādhikāriṇa*) and the village (*grāmādhikāriṇa*).[579] We find the term *deśeśvara* or *deśapāla* in the *Viṣṇudharmottara*.[580]

The kingdom is again divided into so many districts called the *viṣayas*, placed under the lord of the district officers called *viṣayeśvara*. A comparison of the list of officers in our *Purāṇa* with the *Viṣṇudharmottara*[581] leads us to think that the *deśa* and the *viṣaya* are the same territorial division. Our text states that protection of the district contributes to the financial prosperity of the king.[582] So it seems that the officer in charge of the district is to assess and send taxes to the king on the basis of the people's prosperity. It also denotes the duty of the king and his officers to protect them.[583]

---

[575] *CII*, IV, No. 31.p.151, ll. 44-49: *vaṇigbhi pañchabhirddaśabhirapi nagaradharmmamavalaṁbya mārggaśīrṣamāsasya pakṣamāttraṁ devasya viṣṇoryyāttrotsavassārayitavyaḥ.*

[576] *Agni*, 227.53: *rāṣṭreṣu rāṣṭrādhikṛtānsāmantapāpino haret.*

[577] *Ibid.*, 41.27, 65.23, 247.22.

[578] *The Vākāṭaka-Gupta Age*, 1964. pp.283-4.

[579] *Abhilaṣi.*, III.111.63.

[580] II. 61. 2-5.

[581] *Agni*, 223.4; *VDP*, III. 323.29-30.

[582] *Ibid.*, 223.4.

[583] *Ibid.*, 223.4.

Our text states that the king should appoint the head of a single, ten, a hundred and even more villages besides the officer in charge of a district (*viṣaya*). It is further laid down that in the event of some emergency the village-head should try to meet the situation. In the event of his failure, he is to report to the head of ten villages, who reports to the head of a hundred, and the head of a hundred villages to the head of the *viṣaya*.[584]

Between the *viṣaya* and the village[585] lay the *maṇḍala*, the administration of which seems to be assigned to the *maṇḍalādhipati*. The *Agni Purāṇa* states that whosoever makes different kinds of *maṇḍalas* in the worship of a god becomes a *maṇḍalādhipati*.[586]

The *Agni Purāṇa* does not indicate the position of various territorial units in the administrative hierarchy. It only states that the *maṇḍala* is below the *viṣaya* and contains hundreds of villages. The contemporary Jain work, the *Nītivākyāmṛta*[587] places the various territorial divisions of the country in this order: *rāṣṭra*, *deśa*, *viṣaya*, *maṇḍala*, *janapada*, *darat* or *dāraka* and *nigama* under the title *janapadasamuddeśa*, but it does not specify the area occupied by each unit; we are left to conjecture something from the order of their enumeration. Moreover, our *Purāṇa* neither accepts the territorial division of the *Skanda Purāṇa* which makes the *deśa*[588] a smaller unit in comparison with the *maṇḍala*, nor does it accept the *rāṣṭra*, *deśa*, *viṣaya* and *janapada* to be synonymous as defined by the *Amarakośa*.[589] It is very difficult to determine the gradation of the areas as the contemporary epigraphic usage of these terms is not uniform.[590] At best it can be said that our text follows the *Viṣṇudharmottara*.

The smallest administrative unit seems to be the village (*grāma*) and the town (*nagara* or *purī*). The village administration is placed under the village headman called variously as *grāmādhipati*,[591] *grāmeśa*,[592]

---

[584] *Ibid.*, 223.1-4; *VDP*, II. 61.1-7, III. 323,28-30,

[585] *Ibid.*, 212.23: *bhūmimeruṁ cha viṣayaṁ maṇḍalaṁ grāmameva cha.*

[586] *Ibid.*, 211.66: *nānāmaṇḍalakāryāgre maṇḍalādhipatirbhavet.*

[587] *NVA*, 19.1-8.

[588] *Sahyādrikhaṇḍa, uttarārdha*, chapt.4 provides the following definition:—
100 villages = 1 *deśa*
4 deśas = 1 *maṇḍala*
100 *maṇḍalas* = 1 *khaṇḍa*
9 *khaṇḍas* = the whole earth.

[589] *HDS*, Vol.III, p.138.

[590] *Ibid.*, Vol.III, pp.138-9.

[591] *Agni*, 223.1.

[592] *Ibid.*, 223.3.

grāmaṇī[593] and *grāmabhartā*.[594] Our text, at one place, discusses the *Yoga* philosophy and draws a fine analogy between the working of the body organism and the administrative set-up of a village. The five senses of the body are compared to the five householders (*kuṭumbas*) of the village council. It is headed by the soul, which is the loftiest of all like the *mahattara* of the village. The sixth principle is difficult to be won over even by god, demon and man. This may allude to the powerful position enjoyed by the *mahattara*.[595] So the village administration is to be run by the *mahattara* with the help of five members. It is interesting to find that one epigraph[596] of our period compares the senses with a village (*indriyagrāma*). Moreover, Bāṇa[597] provides not only an identical comparison between the five great senses of the body and the *pañchakula* but also points out its duties, which include judicial as well as general administrative functions in the village. The council of five seems to be popular in many parts of India since the Gupta period.[598] In our time the village as well as the town administration seems to be carried on by royal officers with the help of committees called the *pañchakulas*.[599] The epigraphic records show that the members of this council are elected by the residents of the town or the village, as the case may be, for the management of several departments.[600] But how they are elected is not known. Mirashi on the basis of the Dhureti Plates of Trailokyamalla, which refers to a *pañchakuladharmādhikaraṇa*, thinks that like the judicial department managed by a council of five, perhaps other departments of the village and town administration had similar committees.[601] However, our own text does not call all the members of the council *mahattara* as we find them in the Ghugrahati Copper Plate Inscription of Samāchāradeva (end of the

---

[593] *Ibid.*, 351.46, 353.2, 362.10.

[594] *Ibid.*, 258.60.

[595] *Ibid.*, 165.11-12: *kuṭumbai pañchabhirgrāmaḥ ṣaṣṭhastatra mahattaraḥ, devāsura manuṣyairvā sa jetuṁ naiva śakyate*, etc.

[596] *CII*, IV, No.24. Prince of Wales Museum Plates of Jayabhaṭa IV of the year 486 (A. D. 736), l. 20.

[597] *Harsacharita*, VIII, para 24, page 254: *pañchamahābhūtapañchakulādhisṭhitāntahkarṇavyavahāradarśananipuṇāḥ* . . . .

[598] *CII*, III, No. 29. Sāñchī Inscription of Chandragupta II refers to *pañchamaṇḍalī*, which is identical with the *pañchakula*.

[599] *Gūrjara Deśa*, Vol.II, p.412.

[600] *CII*, IV, Introduction, p.cxliv.

[601] *Ibid.*, No.72 of the year 963 (A. D. 1212). 19. *yathāvarttamānasamastavaṇigjanavyavṛhiyamaṇaṁ pañchakuladharmādhikarṇa(e)*.

6th century A. D.).[602] Here the *mahattara*[603] seems to be the head of the council of five. We have no reference to the *mahattamas*,[604] *pañchakulikas*[605] or the *mahāpañchakulikas*[606] referred to in the epigraphic record of our period. The *mahattara* is frequently mentioned in the records of the Later Guptas, the Pāla, the Gurjara-Pratīhāra, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa, the Chaulukyas, and the Gāhaḍavālas.

It is not known from our text how and by whom a council of five was constituted. In the Gupta period[607] we find the chief merchant (*sārthavāha*), the chief scribe (*prathamakāyastha*), the chief artisan (*prathamakulika*) and the president of the guild (*nagaraśreṣṭhi*) to constitute the municipal council. The *Śukranītisāra*[608] states that the king should appoint the following six officers in every village or town, (i) head of the village or the town (*grāmanetara*), (ii) collector of the land revenue (*bhāgahāra*), (iii) collector of the customs duties (*śulkagrāha*), (iv) magistrate (*sāhasādhipati*), (v) scribe (*lekhaka*), and (vi) guard of the village wall (*pratīhāra*).

Nīlakaṇṭha,[609] commenting on a passage from the *Sabhāparva*, also mentions five village officers but somewhat differently. They include the administrator, the collector of revenues, officer in charge of making coordination between the people and the collector of revenues, the scribe and the witness. However, certain officers mentioned by our text may be said to have constituted the council or at least may have helped the head of the village or the town in matters of administration. They are officers in charge of protection against thieves (*chaurarakṣādhikārī*),[610] officer in charge of general peace and tranquillity (*rakṣārthādhikṛta*),[611] customs officer (*śaulbika*)[612], magistrate (*dāṇḍika*)[613] and the scribe

---

[602] *EI*. XVIII, pp.76-77, ll. 6-9.

[603] *Agni*, 165.11.

[604] *CII*, IV, No.74. Kahla Plates of Sodhadeva: year 1135 (A. D. 1079). l.35.

[605] *Ibid.*, Introduction, p.cxlv.

[606] *Ibid.*, No.74. Kahla Plates of Sodhadeva, l.34.

[607] *CA*, p.345.

[608] *Śukra.*, 2.120-21.

[609] Nīlakaṇṭha's comments on the *Sabhāparva*, Poona, 1929, 5.84: *pratigrāmaṁ pañcha pañcheti svanuṣṭhitāḥ śobhanamanuṣṭhitamanuṣṭhānaṁ veṣāṁ te tathā, te cha praśāstā samāhartā samvidhātā lekhakaḥ sākṣī cheti*, etc.

[610] *Agni*, 223.22. 258.55 refers to *grāhaka*.

[611] *Ibid.*, 227.47.

[612] *Ibid.*, 257.24 ; *Yāj.*, 2.173 reads *śaulkika* in place of *śaulbika*.

[613] *Ibid.*, 227.66-67.

(*lekhaka* or the *kāyastha*).[614] Perhaps these officers are supposed to form the committee of five. The list provided by the *Śukranītisāra* is identical with this list.

Our text shows the position of the village headman to be honourable.[615] He is appointed, like heads of other territorial divisions, by the king.[616] He is assisted in the performance of his duties by the *mahattara* and his council of five. According to the *Agni Purāṇa* each village and town should possess common pastures and crown-land.[617] This is perhaps to be looked after by the village headman. An early Gurjara land grant[618] mentions two *kauṭumba-kṣetras* in connection with the demarcation of the boundaries of the donated piece of lands. Mirashi thinks the *kauṭumba-kṣetras* to be the land owned by the cultivators from generation to generation and, therefore, to be taken away from them only in case of non-payment of land revenue,[619] etc. But we find that the terms *kauṭumba* and *kula* are synonymous, and our text states the village council as consisting of five *kuṭumbas*; so the *kauṭumba* land may be taken as the public land managed by one or the other members of the village council. It is further laid down that the village headman (*grāmabhartā*) should be held responsible for acts of rapine and murder committed within his territorial jurisdiction. The officer dealing with thefts is to be held responsible for theft, and the amount stolen is to be realised from him in the case of non-apprehension of the criminal.[620] If the criminal escapes from that village into another, the place where he would go is to be brought to account. In the case of a theft of a horse or an elephant, five or ten successive villages within the radius of two miles from the scene of occurrence are to be held accountable for the crime.[621] So the village officers are placed in charge of peace and order, protection of life and property, and proper management of public and crown property, situated within the village. They are expected to manage temples and properly worship the images of the village. During our period the *mahattaras* are informed of the land grants or the sale of even waste land by the state perhaps to avoid clash of jurisdiction between the village officers and the donee.[622] Sometimes they settled waste land with brāhmaṇas with the permission of the king.[623] The village headman together with the *kuṭumbins* (members of the committee of *pañchakuṭumba*?) sometimes carried out the sale of government lands.[624]

---

[614] *Ibid.*, 223.12, 258.74, 227.63.

[615] *Ibid.*, 362.10: *śreṣṭhe'dhipe grāmaṇīḥ syāt.*

[616] *Ibid.*, 223.1.

[617] *Ibid.*, 257.17-18.

[618] *CII*, IV, No. 22: Añjaneri Plates of Jayabhata III, year 460 (A. D. 710) II.20 and 24.

[619] *Ibid.*, Introduction, p.clxxi.

[620] *Agni,* 223.22.

[621] *Ibid.*, 258.60-61 ; *VDP*, II. 61.49-50.

Our text does not throw any light on the type of administrative arrangements to be followed in the village granted to the brāhmaṇas, officers, etc.

The *sthānapāla* of our text[625] is to be found in the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti*,[626] the *Rāmāyaṇa*,[627] the *Harṣacharita*[628] and the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.[629] That the office existed in our period is corroborated by the Karitalai Stone Inscription of Lakṣamaṇarāja.[630] It is laid down by our *Purāṇa* that the *sthānapāla* should keep in custody lost or stolen things recovered by him for a year, and after that, in the absence of rightful owner, restore it to the royal treasury. So it involves some kind of police duties. It is supported by other works. The *Mitākṣarā* and the *Vīramitrodaya*[631] explain them as the protector of the *sthāna*, a term which in our opinion carries a technical meaning. Vasudev Sharan Agrawal[632] takes this officer as the head of a military garrison. The *sthānapāla*, the *sthānādhikṛta*, the *sthānapati*,[633] the *sthānalaka*[634] or the *sthānaka*[635] seem to be synonymous and mean the head of the police station set up over many villages. The institution of the *sthāna*, as an administrative unit, continued long after our period, and the term *thānā* used for the police station in subsequent times is obviously derived from the Sanskrit term *sthāna.*

---

[622] *The Vākāṭaka-Gupta Age*, p.294.

[623] *EI*, XV, No.7, pp. 131ff.

[624] *CA*, pp.344-5. Increased works of the village administration may have necessitated the increase in their numbers sometimes to eight (*aṣṭakulādhikaraṇa*) or ten.

[625] *Agni*, 257.24.

[626] *Yāj.*, 2.173.

[627] *MW*, p.1263.

[628] Canto VII, para 4, page 205.

[629] *MW*, p. 1263.

[630] *CII*, IV, Pt.I. No.42. p.195n: *purapattanayoḥ sthānaḥ śuklāmekādaśim dadau.*

[631] On *Yāj.*, 2.173.

[632] *Harṣacharita: eka Sāṁskṛtika Adhyayana*. p. 143.

[633] *CII*, IV.No.88. Rājim Stone Inscription of Prithvideva II: year 896 (A. D. 1145).

[634] *Ibid.*, No.7. Bāgh Cave Plate of Subandhu. l. 2.

[635] MW. s. v. *sthāna*. This officer can be compared with the *sthānīya* of the *Arth*.

The system of administration conceived by our text for the village is perhaps intended to be applied to other territorial divisions including the town. Munshi[636] thinks that the '*pañchakulas*' were organs of government at different levels of administration under the Chaulukyas and this committee consisted of learned brāhmaṇas, merchants, and industrialists, officials and non-officials, all nominated. A town is called *pura, nagara, śākhānagara* (suburban town), °*pattana* (port-town), *puṭabhedana, sthānīya,* etc.[637] As for the area of a town it is laid down that the village should measure one hundred arrows, the *kharvaṭa* two hundred arrows, and the town four hundred arrows. Besides, the town should be protected by a wall, so high as not to be seen by a camel.[638] The town is administered by the lord of the town (*purasvāmī*), who may be compared to the village headman.[639]

Local administration as outlined in the *Agni Purāṇa* shows that officers in charge of all the administrative divisions are to be appointed and made responsible to the king. Their salaries and allowances are to be fixed in accordance with the nature and output of their work, a daily report of which is sent to the king by his spies.[640] Our *Purāṇa* does not mention the salary of the officers as is done in the *Manu Smṛti,* the *Śāntiparva* and the *Nītiprakāśikā.*[641] On the other hand it seems to follow *Medhātithi,*[642] who declares the rules laid down by Manu as only approximate and recommendatory and not mandatory; they mean that the emoluments of the officers should be commensurate with their powers and duties. The officers are to be taken to task if they are found misusing their power and neglecting their duties. But this central control is counterbalanced by a strong local council.

---

[636] *Gūrjara Deśa.,* Vol.II, p.412.

[637] *Agni,* 363.4-5.

[638] *Ibid.,* 227.19-20.

[639] *Ibid.,* 41.27, 65.23, 247.22 ; cf. *VDP,* II. 29.90.

[640] *Ibid.,* 223.2: *teṣāṁ bhogabibhāgaścha bhavetkarmānurūpataḥ. nityameva tathā kāryam teṣāṁ chāraiḥ parīkṣaṇam.*

[641] *Manu,* 7.118-9 ; *Śānti.,* 87.6-8 ; *NP.* 8.49-51.

[642] On *Manu,* 7.118-9.

CHAPTER V

REVENUE SYSTEM

The *Agni Purāṇa*[1] repeats the traditional principle, which declares treasury to be the root of the king and adds that sovereignty is subordinate to it. The idea continued to be popular even in the later period. Somadeva Sūri beautifully remarks that it is the treasury and not the life of the king which keeps him alive. He states further that the treasury constitutes sovereignty and not the body of the king.[2] The idea behind this principle is to point out the difficulty in running the administration without resources. The *Agni Purāṇa*, in order to emphasise the necessity of increasing the material resources of the state, compares the poor with the degraded person, and states that a poor man is unable to control even his wife. It adds that all efforts without financial backing are fruitless like the small rivers in summer.[3] So the king is asked to replenish his treasury in order to control the kingdom and to carry out his schemes to fruition.

The *Agni Purāṇa* states that the king can increase his treasury only when his kingdom is well protected.[4] The king receives one-sixth of the good and bad deeds performed by his subjects.[5] It further states that the people, when protected, contribute gold (*hiraṇya*), crops (*dhānya*), clothes, conveyances and other materials to the state, and when they are weak (*savyasana*), all these resources are destroyed.[6] Thus the *Purāṇa* advocates two important principles, taxation in lieu of protection offered and the need to establish peace and tranquillity in the kingdom to increase the prosperity of people as well as of the king. The first principle is very old and important. Manu[7] calls the ruler a thief who receives taxes but does not perform his duties.

Our text, like Kāmandaka,[8] describes the four preoccupations of a king, which may be regarded as the fourfold financial directive for the king. They are earning money through just ways, protecting the treasury, increasing it, and using it rightfully.

---

[1] 241.22: *koṣamūlo hi bhūpatiḥ* ; 242.33: *kośādhinā hi rājatā* ; *Arth.*, 2.2 ; *Śānti.*, 119.16 : *KNS*, 13.33 and 19.16 : *VDP*, II.61.17.

[2] *NVA*, 21.5 and 21.7.

[3] *Agni*, 223.5-7 ; *VDP*, II. 61.10-14.

[4] *Ibid.*, 223.4: *vittādyāpnoti rājā vai viṣayāttu surakṣitāt* ; VDP, II. 61.7.

[5] *Ibid.*, 223.10 : *VDP*, II. 61.25.

[6] *Ibid.*, 241.18-19 ; *KNS*, 13.26-27.

[7] Aiyangar, K. V. R., *Rājadharmakāṇḍa*, Baroda, 1943. Introduction, p.53.

[8] *Agni*, 239.2 ; cf. *KNS*, 1.18.

The *Agni Purāṇa* as well as other *Purāṇas* stress the religious aim of acquiring wealth and state that it is a means to achieve two of the four ideals of human life, piety (*dharma*) and worldly pleasures (*kāma*).[9] Our text leaves out the practical aspects of the functions of the treasury as mentioned by Kāmandaka,[10] who states that treasury leads to the construction of dams and bridges, expansion of trade and commerce, receipt of loyalty from subjects as well as allies, and success in moral, temporal and financial pursuits of life. Thus our text leans towards the *dharmaśāstra*, and its approach is not so practical as that of Kāmandaka.

The *Agni Purāṇa* gives a summary and diffused treatment of the sources of revenue and expenditure. It asks the king to judiciously protect and maintain the eight sources of revenue, agriculture, trade-routes, capital town or the fort (*durga*), dams and bridges, capture of elephants (*kuñjaravandhana*), mines and minerals, levy or import of army (*balādāna*), and settlement of vacant lands.[11] Thus it repeats the old *arthaśāstra-smṛti* view[12] but does not discuss the methods by which these sources contribute to the enrichment of the treasury; only Kauṭilya elaborately treats it.

The *Agni Purāṇa* enjoins the king to levy one-sixth of the autumn crops (*śukadhānya*) and one-eighth of the rain crops (*simbidhānya*) as the king's share of the land produce known as *bali*, but adds that the rate can vary according to changes in time and place.[13] Manu[14] prescribes one-sixth to one-twelfth as the royal share of the produce (*bhāga*) but does not explain the basis of this difference. Viṣṇu and Kātyāyana[15] fix the rate of *bali* at one-sixth. Bṛhaspati[16] fixes the king's share in the land produce at one-sixth of rain crops, one-eighth of autumn crops and one-tenth of crops produced on virgin soil. The highest rate of one-third of the land produce is prescribed by the *Vṛddhahārita Smṛti.*[17] However, the view of our *Purāṇa* is liberal and conforms to that of the *Viṣṇudharmottara.*[18] It seems that the *Agni Purāṇa* prescribes a lower rate for the crops of rainy season possibly to cover the damage caused by floods.

---

[9] *Ibid.*, 239.30 *dharmādivṛddhaye.*, 223.5 ; *VDP*, II. 61.10.

[10] *KNS*, 13.32.

[11] *Agni*, 239.44-45.

[12] *Arth.*, VII.1.19: *durgasetuvaṇikpathaśunyaniveśakhanidravyahastivana karmaṇi* ; *KNS*, 5.78 has the same verse with only a little difference ; *Manu*, 7.154 refers to eight royal duties but does not specify them. Kullūka Bhaṭṭa p.260-61 refers to the various interpretations of the term *kṛtsnam chāṣṭa vidhaṁ karma*. One of the interpretations offered by Medhātithi is the same as in the *KNS* and the *Agni Purāṇa*. Commentator Sītārāma quotes the verse in the *Nītiprakāśikā*, pp.14-15.

[13] *Agni*, 223.26-27.

[14] *Manu*, 7.130.

[15] *Rājadharmakāṇḍa*, p.90.

[16] *Ibid.*, p.89.

Another important source of revenue recommended by the *Agni Purāṇa* is *bhoga*, which has been explained to mean the periodical supply of fruits, firewood, flowers, etc., which the villages had to furnish to the king. The *Agni Purāṇa* speaks nothing about the rate of *bhoga*. The term is to be explained with the help of Manu and the inscriptions of our period. Our *Purāṇa*, like Manu, provides for the appointment of heads of one, ten and hundred villages, and the lord of the *viṣaya*, and states that the share of these officers in the *bhoga* will be in accordance with their work. Manu lays down that the village headman should partake of the daily supply of cereals, drinks, firewood, etc., made by the villagers to the king.[19]

The *Agni Purāṇa* knows two kinds of tolls (*śulka*): land customs and the ferry charges. Duties are to be levied from the products of one's own country as well as imported goods. The duty charged on products of king's own territory should be one-twentieth.[20] It may be compared to the excise duty of our time. The *Agni Purāṇa*[21] repeats the old principle of taking into account the wear and tear, the expenditure incurred, and finally the benefit of the merchants at the time of fixing the customs on foreign merchandise. However, it does not allow the duties to exceed one-twentieth of the net profit. In this our *Purāṇa* follows the *Viṣṇudharmottara*,[22] and is liberal in fixing the duty levied on home products. Viṣṇu, as quoted by the *Rājanītiprakāśa*,[23] allows the king to take one-tenth of the net profit. Kauṭilya[24] fixes the import duty at one-fifth of the value, which seems to be very high. The import duties seem to be liberal in our period. Somadeva Sūri[25] cautions against increase in import duties and forcible seizure of foreign goods which, according to him, leads to a decrease in the trade from other countries and constitutes a loss in revenue, because no one would come for trade again just as a wooden pot cannot be used for cooking on fire a second time. Our text does not clarify, as the *Viṣṇudharmottara* does, whether the import or export duties should be in cash or in kind. But as it is a tax on profit rather than on capital, so it may have been intended to be in cash only. The *Viṣṇudharmottara*[26] clearly ordains that the duties should never be accepted in different coins. However, we find a large number of Roman and other coins of earlier period in southern India which denotes the flourishing maritime trade with other countries.[27] Lack of foreign exchange facilities in the period might have led to the acceptance of only one coinage.

---

[17] 4.204: *tribhāgamāhareddhānyāddhanāt ṣaḍbhāgameva cha.*

[18] II. 61.60-61.

[19] *Agni*, 223.1-2 ; cf. *Manu*, 7.115-8.

[20] *Ibid.*, 223.23.

[21] *Ibid.*, 223.24-25 ; *VDP*. II. 61.53-56. But curiously enough at III. 323.44 it puts import duties at one-fifteenth.

[22] II. 61.53-56. But at another place (III. 323.44) it repeats the view of Viṣṇu quoted below.

[23] p.264: *svadeśa paṇyāchcha śulkāṁśaṃ daśamamādadyāt.*

[24] Ghosal, U. N., *Hindu Revenue System*, p.69

In addition to the customs duty we find the levy of the tolls (*sthalaśulka*) and ferry charges (*taraśulka*).[28] They are also referred to in earlier literature. Hsüan Tsang[29] speaks of a small amount being charged at the river side and at the road barriers in his time.

The *Agni Purāṇa* authorises the king to receive one-fifth of animals, one-sixth of gold, perfumery, medicinal herbs, liquids, flowers, roots and fruits, leaves, vegetables, grass, bamboo, things made of bamboo and hide, wicker-works, earthen and stone vassels, honey, meat and clarified butter.[30] Here the view of Manu is accepted but with a little modification. Manu[31] prescribes one-fiftieth of animals and gold as tax, but our text[32] makes it one-fifth of animals and one-sixth of gold, which may be due to a mistake in copying. The *Viṣṇudharmottara*[33] prescribes the levy to be equal to the royal share of the produce, which may evidently mean one-sixth. However, the rule as laid down by these *Purāṇas*, does not seem to be popular even in the later period. Someśvaradeva[34] and other digest writers[35] quote only views which lay down one-fiftieth as the tax on animals and gold. Since taxes are levied on the sale of these commodities they are called *paṇya* by some texts. The term *hiraṇya* used by our text and others does not mean tax levied in cash; it seems to be a tax imposed on the sale of gold. If we accept the explanation offered by Mitramiśra, it is a tax levied on the interest gained by moneylenders, and is to be realised annually like the taxes on other merchandise for sale.[36]

---

[25] *NVA*, 8.11-12: *śulkavṛddhirbalātpaṇyagrahaṇaṁ cha deśāntarabhāṇḍānāmapraveśe hetuḥ . kāṣṭhapātryāmekadaiva padārtho radhyate.* See the commentary on above also.

[26] II. 61.59: *bhinnakarṣāpaṇaṁ śulkaṁ na grāhyaṁ pṛthivīkṣitā* ; III. 323. 45: *na bhinnakarṣāpaṇamasti śulkam.*

[27] *The Vākāṭaka-Gupta Age*, 1946, p.335.

[28] *Agni*, 223.25, 258.20 ; *Arth.*, 2.21-22 ; *Yāj.*, 2.263, etc.

[29] Beal, *Travels of Hiouen-Thsang*, Vol.II, p.142.

[30] *Agni*, 223.27-29.

[31] 7.130: *pañchāśadbhāga ādeyo rājñā paśuhiraṇyayoḥ.*

[32] 223.27.

[33] II. 61.61: *rājāṁśabhāgamāddyādrājā paśuhiraṇyayoḥ.*

[34] *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.164 nearly same as in Manu 7.130.

Lack of banking facilities led the people in ancient India to bury their valuables underneath the ground. In course of time its trace might be lost. So treasure-trove is considered to be a source of revenue in early texts. The view of the *Agni Purāṇa* on the distribution of the treasures found accidentally is based on caste principle. When a brāhmaṇa finds a treasure, he shall pay nothing to the king, but if a kṣatriya, vaiśya or śūdra recovers an old treasure, the royal share shall be one-sixteenth, one-eighth and one-fourth respectively.[37] The *Agni Purāṇa* does not indicate the nature of distribution when the king himself finds a hidden treasure. Manu, Yājñavalkya, Viṣṇu, and the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* lay down that the king shall give away half of such a treasure to the brāhmaṇas and appropriate the other half to his own treasury.[38]

The income from the crown-land seems to have been another source of revenue. Our text advises the king to set apart a piece of crown-land as common pasture of the village.[39] It includes the crown-land and the king's property (*upanidhi*) in the list of objects of which ownership is not lost by adverse encroachment for long.[40] Thus according to the *Agni Purāṇa* the king is expected to hold crown-land in various parts of the kingdom. Yājñavalkya and Someśvaradeva also lay down that the king should provide common pastures in the uncultivated areas of the villages.[41] Kauṭilya[42] enjoins the levy of a tax called *vraja* on the tending of cattle. Pasture continues to constitute a source of state revenue under the Kalachuris[43] and the Gāhaḍavālas. According to one view the tax on pastures is called *tṛṇayuti* and *gochara* in the inscriptions.[44] Alberuni also testifies to the existence of this tax.[45] Hsüan Tsang[46] refers to the cultivators of the crown-land paying a sixth part of the land produce to the king. According to him the crown-land contributed to the upkeep of the whole government, provided salary to the high officers of the realm, reward to distinguished persons, and sacrificial offerings as well as gifts to various religious sects.

---

[35] *Rājadharmakāṇḍa,* p.88 ; *Rājanītiprakāśa,* p.260 quotes *Gautama* and *Viṣṇu,* whose views are identical with Manu.

[36] *Rājanītiprakāśa,* p.260: *ye cha hiraṇyasya prayogeṇa vārdhuṣikāḥ tebhyaḥ pañchasadbhāgo vṛddhergrāhyaḥ ;* p.261: *ayaṁ cha bhāgaḥ saṁvatsare saṁvatsare grāhyaḥ.*

[37] *Agni,* 223.14-15.

[38] *Manu,* 18.38: *Yāj.,* 2.34 ; *Viṣṇu* as quoted by the *Rājanītiprakāśa,* p.267 and *Smṛti-Saṁdarbha,* Vol.I, p.410 : VDP, II. 61.34.

[39] *Agni* 257.17 . . . . *bhūmirājavaśena vā.*

[40] *Ibid.,* 253. 53-54 ; cf. Arth. 3.16.

The law of inheritance and ownership also provided a source of revenue, according to the *Agni Purāṇa*. It lays down that the property of a merchant dying in a foreign land should go to his relatives, and in their absence to the king.[47] Thus property without heir is liable to be escheated to the state. The same rule occurs with little difference in Kauṭilya, Gautama, Vasiṣṭha, Viṣṇu, Manu, Yājñavalkya, Nārada and Bṛhaspati.[48] It seems from the early Buddhist and Brāhmaṇical literature that the rule was actually applied. Kālidāsa furnishes one such example in his *Śākuntala*.[49] On the same analogy our *Purāṇa* accepts the king's right over such water reservoirs (*setu*) as are built by one on the land of others and are without rightful claimants.[50]

Similar to the above is the escheat of property lying unclaimed. Here the *Agni Purāṇa* repeats the view of Manu and Yājñavalkya. It advises the king to keep in his custody such property as has been without owner for three years, and to confiscate it afterwards to his treasury.[51] It further ordains that lost or stolen property found by the police-officer (*sthānapāla*) or the customs officer should be kept in royal custody for one year, and if it is not claimed by its rightful owner within one year, it should go to the treasury.[52] Moreover, the *Agni Purāṇa* authorises the king to claim one-twentieth of the abandoned goods.[53] Kauṭilya[54] prescribes a similar rule for unclaimed property, but the period suggested for custody in the custom-house is only forty-five days. But we find that in our period the king's right to use such property is a disputed question. *Medhātithi*[55] quotes verses to refute the view of the *Madanapārijāta* of Viśveśvara, who permits the king to enjoy such property short of destroying it and states that the king should take possession of such property after three years. Somadeva Sūri goes one step further and lays down that the king should not use judicial fines, money won in gambling, lost or heirless property, things siezed from thieves, the property of woman, and the property left out by one in the times of public danger.[56]

---

[41] *Yāj.*, 2.166 ; *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.168: *bhūpradeśamakṛṣṭaṁ tu gavāṁ chārāya kalpayet.*

[42] *Arth.*, 2.29-30.

[43] *CII*, IV, Introduction, p.cxli.

[44] Niyogi, Roma, *History of the Gāhaḍavāla Dynasty*, p.185.

[45] *Alberuni's India*, Vol.II, p.149.

[46] Beal, *Travels of Hiouen-Thsang*, Vol.II, p.132.

[47] *Agni*, 258.53.

[48] *Gautama*, 28.41-42 ; *Vasiṣṭha*, 16.83-87 ; *Viṣṇu*, 17.13-14, *Manu*, 9.188-9 ; *Yāj.*, 2.264 ; *Bṛhaspati*, p.216, v.119 ; *Nārada*, 3.16-18.

[49] Ghoshal. *Hindu Revenue System*. pp.113-4.

[50] *Agni*, 257.8.

[51] *Ibid.*, 223.16-17 ; cf. *Manu*. 8.30 ; *VDP*. II. 61.42-43.

The *Agni Purāṇa* advises the king to dispossess the owner of virgin land, who neither tills it nor causes it to be tilled by another, and instructs him to settle such virgin land for cultivation with another person.[57] It leads us to think that all such virgin land belongs to the king. It is just possible that the compiler of our *Purāṇa* had the idea of settling such land on the payment of some fee, somewhat comparable to *salāmī* under British rule.

Another item of revenue described in our text is the contribution from artisans and workers in the form of manual labour. The skilled artisans are asked to work one day every month for the king, and the manual labourers are to work for the king as long as they are fed. This is the traditional labour-tax, and the rule laid down for it in our *Purāṇa* is found in the works of Gautama, Vasiṣṭha, Manu and Viṣṇu, and in the *Viṣṇudharmottara*.[58] The *Rājanītiprakāśa*[59] collects the views of all these authorities.

---

[52] *Ibid.*, 257.24 ; same as in the *Yāj.*, 2.173-4.

[53] *Ibid.*, 258.51.

[54] *Arth.*, 3.16.

[55] on *Manu*, 8.30.

[56] *NVA*, 9.5: *daṇḍa-dyūta-mṛta-vismṛta-chaura-pāradārika-prajāviplavajāni. dravyāṇi na rājā svayamupayuñjīta.*

[57] *Agni*, 257.9.

[58] *Ibid.*, 223.33 ; cf. *VDP*, II. 61.68 ; *Gautama*, 10. 31 ; *Vasiṣṭha*, 9.28 ; *Manu*, 7.138 ; *Viṣṇu*, as quoted by the *Rājanītiprakāśa*, p.274; *śilpinaḥ karmopajīvinaścha māsenaikam karma kuryuḥ*. M.N. Dutta's translation of the *Agni Purāṇa's* verse (Vol. II, p.800) is wrong as he translates the term *māse naikam* to mean for one month in a year.

[59] pp. 274-5.

The *Agni Purāṇa* shows that the king advanced loans on interest to private persons. It lays down that if the king lends money in accordance with religious scriptures, he is not to be censured.[60] It further states that when debt is repaid to various creditors the brāhmaṇa is entitled to receive back his money first and the king next.[61] Thus interest on loan is considered to be a source of income to the king.

An important revenue term used by the *Agni Purāṇa* is *upahāra.*[62] It might refer to presents or tributes offered to the king as a token of submission by the weaker state, his allies or villagers. The Allahabad Stone Pillar Inscription of Samudra Gupta informs us that the kings of countries, subdued by him, paid regular tributes to him.[63] The general literature of our period[64] is replete with such examples. Feudatories, chiefs and lesser kings made presents to their overlords. The *Agni Purāṇa* ordains that treaties of friendship should be negotiated with some gifts.[65] If we accept the explanation of Mirashi[66] the *ditya* tax under the Traikuṭakas of Chedi was a kind of customary present which the villagers offered to the king on the occasion of the birth of a prince or the marriage of a princess.

As we have seen, the judicial fines realised by the court of justice also contributed to the state coffer.[67]

Spoils of war is thought to be a source of gain to the royal treasury. The *Agni Purāṇa* counsells the king to divide booty of war among his soldiers and to appropriate the gems and precious stones to himself.[68] The *Viṣṇudharmottara* extends the royal right to shields, weapons and conveyances.[69] On the other hand the *Bṛhatparāśara Smṛti*[70] advises the king to spend the wealth earned in war on Vedic sacrifices, which indicates that the *Agni Purāṇa* is not so much under religious influence.

---

[60] *Agni*, 253.66 ; cf. *Yāj.*, 2.40.

[61] *Ibid.*, 254.1 ; cf. *Yāj.*, 2.41 and Kātyāyana quoted by the *Vīramitrodaya* on this verse of the *Yājñavalkya*.

[62] *Ibid.*, 362.36.

[63] *CII*, III, No.8.

[64] *Raghuvaṁśa*, 4.50.70 and 79 ; *Naiṣadhīyacharita*, 21.3.

[65] *Agni*, 240.9 ; *KNS*, 9.20-22.

[66] *CII*, IV, Introduction, p.clxxii. Strangely enough at another place (*Ibid*, Intro., p.cxli) Mirashi takes *ditya* as land tax and the *dityogrāhaka* as an officer in charge of land revenue.

[67] *Supra.*

[68] *Agni*, 236.63: *ratnāni rājagāmini amātyena kṛte raṇe.*

[69] *VDP*, II. 177.85: *ratnāni rājagāmini charma vāhanamāyudham. sarvamanvadbhavettasya yadyenaiva raṇe hṛtam.*

[70] 12.56: *raṇārjitena vittena rājā kuryānmakhāndvijāna.*

Our text authorises the king to confiscate all merchandise, ordinarily banned from sale or meant for his use but offered for sale in the market.[71] Manu and Yājñavalkya[72] also enunciate a similar principle. According to the *Mitākṣarā* and Kullūka Bhaṭṭa[73] such merchandise comprised gems, precious stones, horses and elephants in normal times and grain during the period of famines. Whether such a rule worked in practice is doubtful, for the Pratīhāra and Kalachuri inscriptions refer to the sale of horses and elephants[74]

We find some important, though in many cases the traditional, principles of taxation in the *Agni Purāṇa*. First, it is held that taxation is meant for providing protection to the people against internal and external dangers as well as divine calamities. The king is called *ṣaḍbhāga* only when he affords peace and tranquillity to his subjects and thus increases their prosperity. As a corollary, he is warned against giving trouble to his people and informed that if he pursues a policy of repression, he will be destroyed soon and will have a long sojourn in hell.[75] Secondly, the king is not allowed to increase the taxes according to his own discretion, but has to follow the rules laid down by the *dharmaśāstra*, a principle also enunciated by all the *arthaśāstra-smṛti* writers.[76]

Thirdly, our text lays down that taxation should take account of time and place,[77] as is stated in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Viṣṇudharmottara*.[78] This implies that the rate prescribed by the scriptures should not be taken by the king rigidly. This provision is laid down perhaps to meet extraordinary situations such as famine, internal revolts, external invasions, etc.

The king is allowed by the *Agni Purāṇa* to receive taxes even from persons who sell merchandise of a little importance such as roots, flowers, fruits, grass, vegetables, earthenware, etc. It adds that those who live by dint of their manual labour and cannot pay taxes should contribute to the king. The *Agni Purāṇa* widens the scope of taxation to the farthest limit and states that the king shares the spiritual merit as well as sin earned by his people.[79]

---

[71] *Agni*, 258.51.

[72] *Manu*, 8.399 ; *Yāj.*, 2.261.

[73] *Mit.* on *Yāj.* 2.261, and Kullūka on *Manu* 8.399.

[74] *Supra.*

[75] *Agni.*, 223.7, 225.31.

[76] *Ibid.*, 223.13: *śāstroktaṁ karmādadīta ; KNS*, 13.54: *nyāyataścha karādānaṁ ; Mbh.* quoted by the *Rājanītiprakāśa*, p.276: *dharmārjito mahākośo ; VDP*, II. 61.31 ; *NP*, 8.56.

[77] *Ibid.*, 223.27.

[78] *Śānti.*, 38.12: *na chāsthāne na chākāle karāṁstebhyo nipātayet ; VDP*, II. 61.61: *rājā balyarthamādadyāddeśakālānurūpakam.*

Finally, our *Purāṇa* states that the king should take a portion of each man's earning in order to give it back to him in the form of his livelihood, in the same manner as the sun receives a portion of all the waters on the earth and returns it in the form of rain.[80] We find the same example in the *Manu Smṛti* and the *Raghuvaṁśa*.[81] The simile implies that taxation should be universal but based on reciprocity, and taxes should be spent on public welfare rather on the king's personal luxury. The first point is made in the *Mahābhārata*,[82] the *Arthaśāstra*,[83] the law-books of Manu[84] and Bṛhatparāśara,[85] and the *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi*.[86] The last two lay down that the king should collect taxes little by little. The *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi*[87] states that the treasury should be filled up gradually in the same way as an ant-hill or a bee-hive is constructed gradually. The *Agni Purāṇa* enjoins the king to provide for the welfare of his subjects out of taxes. It stresses that the king's welfare lies in the welfare of his people. The view of our *Purāṇa* and the *Raghuvaṁśa* that taxation returns to the people in fertilising showers is criticised by Ghoshal as a 'vulgar fallacy'.[88] But according to the modern principle of public finance the people should not be afraid of heavy taxation because only through it development work for public welfare can be effectively executed[89]. Kāmandaka,[90] Somadeva Sūri[91] and Someśvaradeva[92] advise the king to spend as little as possible and to maintain a huge treasury. Somadeva Sūri compares the royal treasury to the ascetic's water-pot which possesses a large hole to take in but a little one to give out. Such a view does not seem to favour much expenditure on the welfare of the tax-payers. But in this respect our text adopts a liberal attitude.

---

[79] *Agni*, 223.10 ; *Viṣṇú Smṛti*, III in *Smṛti-Saṁdarbha*, Vol.I,p.409.

[80] Dutt M. N., *Eng.Tr.*, Vol. II. p.858.

[81] *Manu*. 9.304-5 ; *Raghuvaṁśa*, I. 18.

[82] *Śānti*., 71.16ff, 88.7.

[83] 5.2.

[84] 7.129.

[85] 12.65: *gṛhaṇīyātsarvadā rājā karānapīḍyanprajāḥ stoke stokān pṛthak sāmnā sa bhuṅkte suchiraṁ dharām.*

[86] I. 2.540-2.

[87] *Agni*, 223.8.

[88] Ghosal, U. N., *op cit.*, p.20n.

[89] Dalton, Hugh. *Principles of Public Finance*, London, 1949, pp.6-16 ; Hicks ; Ursulla K., *Public Finance*, Cambridge, 1961. pp. 22-29.

[90] *KNS*. 4.62: : *bahvādāno'lpa niḥsrāvaḥ . . .*

[91] *NVA*, 18.7: *āyavyayamukhyormunikamaṇḍalurnidarśanameva.*

[92] *Abhilaṣi*., I. 2.542.

Our *Purāṇa* grants immunity from taxation to brāhmaṇas, women and ascetics.[93] Brāhmaṇas as a class seem to be the most important beneficiaries. The *Agni Purāṇa* repeats the idea of Manu and the *Mahābhārata*, and lays down that the king should not levy taxes from the brāhmaṇas in spite of his great inclination to do so.[94] Manu exempts only learned brāhmaṇas but the *Agni Purāṇa* extends this concession to all the brāhmaṇas. Our text refers to the Vedic period when brāhmaṇas claim exemption from taxation on the ground that they are under the tutelage of Soma (Moon) and not of the temporal king.[95] However, the *dharmaśāstra* literature[96] grants immunity to the brāhmaṇas because they pay their taxes in terms of virtuous deeds. Though our *Purāṇa* provides exemption to all the brāhmaṇas, a practice noticed by Alberuni in his times,[97] this privilege was disputed. Nārada[98] advocates a limited taxation even on the learned brāhmaṇas, and states that commodities owned by the brāhmaṇas and intended for trade should be taxed. The *Vaijayantī*,[99] a work of the seventeenth century A.D., interprets the *Viṣṇudharmasūtra*, III. 26 to mean that only learned brāhmaṇas are free from taxes. Parāśara enjoins the brāhmaṇas to pay one-sixth of the land produce to the king if they engage themselves in agriculture.[100] The *Śāntiparva* advocates levy of taxes and corvée from such brāhmaṇas as are not learned and do not perform sacrifices.[101] It adds that in financial crisis the king should collect taxes from all brāhmaṇas except those who are *brahmasama* (brāhmaṇas who have mastered all the lores

[93] *Agni*, 223.25 and 223.30.

[94] *Ibid.*, 223.30: *priyaṁ chāpi na vā''dadyādbrāhmaṇebhyástathā karam.* But a better reading of the verse is provided by the *Manu Smṛti* 7.133: *mriyamāṇo'pyādadīta na rājā śrotriyātkaram*; the same verse we find in the *Mahābhārata*.

[95] *Ibid.*. 19.23; Jayaswal, K. P., *Hindu Polity*, Bangalore, 1955, pp.205-7.

[96] *HDS*, Vol.II. Pt.I, pp. 143-145; *Ibid.*, Vol.III, pp.194-5.

[97] *Alberuni's India*, Vol.II, p.149.

[98] *HDS*, Vol.III. p.194-5: *sadā śrotriyavarjyāni śulkanyāhuḥ prajānatā, gṛhopayogi yachchaiṣāṁ na vaṇijyakarmaṇi.*

[99] *Ibid.*, p.195: *brāhmaṇebhyaḥ karādānam na kuryāt.* The *Vaijayanti* says '*parantu śrotriyebhyaḥ . . .*' etc.

[100] *Parāśara*, 2.9 and 14: *brāhmaṇastu kṛṣim kṛtvā mahādoṣamavāpnuyāt rājñe dattvā tu ṣaḍabhāgaṁ devānañchaikaviṁśakam.*

[101] *Śānti.*, 76.2-10: *aśrotriyāḥ sarva eva sarvechānāhitāgnayah, tān sarvān dhārmiko rājā baliṁ viṣṭiṁ cha kārayet.*

and who treat all equally well) and *devasama* (brāhmaṇas who have studied the three Vedas and follow their prescribed duties).[102]

Though the *Bṛhatparāśara Smṛti* and the *Nītivākyāmṛta*[103] allow the king to appropriate the property belonging to the temple in the times of emergency, our *Purāṇa* condemns this practice and repeats the injunction found in the Gupta and post-Gupta land grants, according to which land granted to brāhmaṇas and temples should not be resumed. It states that appropriation of the temple fund and the property of the brāhmaṇas entail a long sojourn in hell.[104] Thus the *Agni Purāṇa* is a supporter of the brāhmaṇic privileges.

Our text gives some indication of the revenue organisation. It provides for a department for fixing the boundaries of land. In the absence of a well-marked boundary, the king is asked to demarcate it with the help of surveyors (*kṣiticháriṇaḥ*),[105] probably attached to the revenue department. It knows of only two revenue officers, one in charge of land tolls (*śaulkika*) and the other in charge of ferry dues (*tarika*).[106] It is laid down that the officer in charge of ferry charges shall be fined ten *paṇas* if he demands land tolls,[107] so that the functions of the two are clearly demarcated.

The *Agni Purāṇa* states that persons responsible for the destruction of state custom-house situated on the sea shore (*samudragṛha*) shall be fined fifty *paṇas*.[108] Thus provision is made for fixed places for the collection of customs duties.[109] This is supported by the *Viṣṇudharmottara,*[110] which lays down that the duties should be levied at one place and in one coin only.

---

[102] *HDS*, Vol.II, Pt.I, p.143.

[103] *Bṛhatparāśara*, 12.61-64, advocates the use of the temple fund and the wealth of the usurers, low people (*kadarya*), heretics (*pāṣaṇḍi*), and prostitutes (*gaṇikā*). The *NVA* 21.14 mentions four methods to improve depleted treasury. They are use of the surplus fund of temples, brāmaṇas and the merchants, benevolence (*pratyādāna*) from the rich, the widow, the officers, village headmen, prostitutes, guilds (*saṁgha*) and the heretics (*pākhandis*), or the Buddhist and Jain monasteries according to the commentator of the *NVA*, request to rich persons of the towns and the village to share their wealth with the king, and repeated requests to ministers, priests, commander-in-chief and the feudatory kings.

[104] *Agni*, 222.11 and 222.15-16: *devadravyādiharaṇātkalpaṁ tu narake vaset, ...dvijasvaṁ na harennṛpaḥ*, etc.

[105] *Ibid.*, 257.3; cf. *Manu*, 8.258 and 8.265; *Yāj.*, 2.152. See *Eng.Tr.* of the *Agni Purāṇa*, Vol.II, p.926.

[106] *Ibid.*, 257.24.

[107] *Ibid.*, 258.20; cf. *Viṣṇu Smṛti*, chapt.5, *quoted in the Smṛti-Saṁdarbha*, Vol.I, p.417: *tārikaḥ sthalajaṁ gṛhṇan daśa paṇān daṇḍyaḥ*, etc.; *Yāj.*, 2.263.

[108] *Ibid.*, 258.27-28; Yāj., 2.232-3; *Viṣṇu Smṛti*, chapt.5 in the *Smṛti-Saṁdarbha*, Vol.I, p.417.

Our *Purāṇa* neither defines expenditure (*vyaya*), as is done by Somadeva Sūri,[111] nor provides a systematic treatment of the items of state expenditure. The first charge on the state exchequer seems to be the provision for the comfortable upkeep of the brāhmaṇas. The king is enjoined to inquire into the learning and the means of livelihood of the learned brāhmaṇas of his kingdom and to provide decent annuities to them.[112] He is to set apart a portion of his capital to settle the brāhmaṇas who are learned and follow their prescribed duties.[113] Like Manu, Yājñavalkya, the *Nītiprakāśikā* and the *Viṣṇudharmottara,* our text declares that a gift to the brāhmaṇa is an imperishable treasure, and so the king should offer gifts to him.[114] It advises that brāhmaṇas should be honoured with offers of land, hamlets, cows, villages and various other things for gaining religious merits, and particularly on such important occasions as coronation, propitiation of different calamities and planets.[115] It[116] assigns as many as six chapters to the treatment of the various types of gift, which indicates its popularity in contemporary times. We find the description of gifts in almost all the *Purāṇas* except the *Vāyu*, the *Viṣṇu*, the *Mārkaṇḍeya*, the *Brahma*, the *Brahmāṇḍa* and the *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa,*[117] which, except the last one, were compiled earlier. The most detailed description is provided by the *Matsya Purāṇa,*[118] in thirty chapters. The popularity of making gifts to the brāhmaṇas in our period is supported by numerous land grants of Gupta and post-Gupta times. We have also literary references to various gifts offered to the brāhmaṇas.[119]

---

[109] *Ibid.*, 258.52.

[110] *VDP*, II. 61.57 and 59: *diśi diśyekameva svāchchhulkāsthānaṁ nṛpasya tu .. . bhinnakarṣāpaṇaṁ' śulkaṁ na grāhyaṁ pṛthivikṣitā ;* III.323.45-46: *śulkasthānambhavedekaṁ na dvitīyaṁ kathañchana . . .* etc. ; *Vasiṣṭha,* 19.25 contains the same verse as in the *VDP*, III. 323.46.

[111] *NVA*, 18.9.

[112] *Agni*, 223.31; *VDP*, II. 61.66.

[113] *Ibid.*, 257.36 ; *Yāj.*, 2.185 ; *CII*, IV. p.298 Khaira Plate of Yaśaḥkarṇa: Year 823 (A. D. 1076) informs us that the Kalachuri King Gāṅgeyadeva established a settlement of brāhmaṇas. Thus we find that the advice of our *Purāṇa* was actually followed in our period.

[114] *Ibid.*, 225.23 ; cf. *Manu*, 7.82 , *Yāj.*, 1.315 ; *NP*, 8.62 ; *VDP*, II. 65.60.

[115] *Ibid.*, 218.32, 266.20, etc.; *VDP*, II.65.48

[116] *Ibid.*, chapts, 208-13.

[117] Tandon, Yasapal., *Purāṇa-Viṣaya-Samanukramaṇikā*, Hoshiarpur, 1952, p.33.

[118] Chapts.81-91 204-6 and 273-88.

Further the king is instructed by our *Purāṇa* to spend on the care and maintenance of the poor, the destitute, the widow and women in general.[120] This is in line with the *arthaśāstra-smṛti* provision, though relief measures suggested here are not so liberal.[121] Furthermore, the king is advised by our text to provide pensions to the relatives of his soldiers,—a provision found in the *Arthaśāstra* and the law-book of Vasiṣṭha.[122] The *Viṣṇudharmottara*,[123] however, restricts royal relief to such women as possess no son. But Somadeva Sūri[124] declares that the king who does not look after the progeny of persons killed while on government duty becomes indebted to them.

The *Agni Purāṇa* indicates that the officers in charge of one, ten or hundred villages or the lord of the *viṣaya* are to be provided with a share in the daily offerings of revenue (*bhoga*) made by the villagers.[125] It mentions regular payment of wages to soldiers as a strong point of the army.[126] It further recommends to the king to arrange for the livelihood of his loyal servants[127] and to bestow rewards and marks of distinction on them.[128] Lakṣmīdhara quotes *Śaṅkha-Likhita*[129] and supports the idea of special rewards. However, the *Agni Purāṇa* does not discuss the scale of pay and emoluments, as is done in great detail by Kauṭilya.

The government is expected to spend a good deal on the defence of the kingdom. The tone of the *Agni Purāṇa* leads us to conclude that a large amount is to be spent on presents to the inimical as well as friendly kings, on bribes to create dissension in the rank and file of the enemy, and on preparation and execution of war efforts.[130] The system of offering monetary allurements is recognised as one of the constituents of the state by the *Viṣṇudharmottara*.[131] So the ideal of an expansionist state advocated by our *Purāṇa* presupposes huge military expenditure.

---

[119] Bhāsa in one of his drama depicts Karṇa as stating that the kṣatriyas earn through arrow, and so a kṣatriya father is really mistaken if he earns for his son. Bhāsa adds further that the king should bestow all his riches on the brāhmaṇas and leave the bow as the only legacy for his son: *bāṇādhīnā ksatriyāṇāṁ samṛdbhiḥ putrāpekṣī vañchyate sannidhātā viprotsaṅge vittamāvarjya sarvaṁ rājñā devaṁ chāpamātraṁ sutebhyaḥ.* (*Pañcharātra*. Banaras, 1958, 1.24).

[120] *Agni*, 225.15;

[121] *Arth.*, 2.1 ; *Gautama.*, 10.9-12. 18.31 ; Śānti., 86.23 ; consult Ghosal's *Hindu Revenue System*, p.160 and *HDS*, Vol.III, p.59.

[122] *Agni*, 236.65: *devādipūjanaṁ kuryādrakṣedyodhakuṭumbakam* ; cf. *Arth.*, 5.3 ; *Vasiṣṭha*, 19.20.

[123] II. 177.92.

[124] *NVA*, 30.93: *rājā rājakāryeṣu mṛtānāṁ santatimapoṣayannṛṇabhāgīsyāt . . .*

[125] *Agni*, 223.2.

[126] *Ibid.*, 239.31; KNS, 4.64.

[127] *Ibid.*, 239.41; cf. *KNS*, 5.46.

[128] *Ibid.*, 221.6: *vastraṁ ratnamalaṅkāraṁ rājñā dattaṁ cha dhārayet* ; *VDP*, II. 25.16; *NP*, 8.27.

[129] *Rājadharmakāṇḍa*, pp.81-82.

In addition to all these items of expenditure the *Agni Purāṇa* provides for the performance of coronation,[132] its anniversary,[133] various religious and propitiary rituals,[134] organisation of festivals in honour of gods,[135] raising of flag-staff of Indra,[136] worship of goddess Durgā in the month of Āśvina,[137] and of royal emblems,[138] etc. Our *Purāṇa* also commends to the king the construction of temples and provision for painting, dance, music and the purificatory bath of the images.[139] That this actually worked in practice is shown by epigraphic evidence. The Chaulukya king Bhogaśakti granted eight villages for providing materials for the worship of the god, the repairs of the temples and the maintenance of a *sattra* in the town of Jayapura. He assigned certain rights, levies and taxes to the temple and exempted the merchants of the town from the octroi duties and the obligation to serve meals to the royal officers in return for celebrating the annual *yātrā* festival and looking after the service and property of the god.[140]

A kind of budgetary policy of the state is formulated by the *Agni Purāṇa* by stating that half of the daily revenue of the king should be deposited into the treasury and the other half be given away to the brāhmaṇas.[141] Someśvaradeva, the *Śivadharma* and Hemādri, as quoted by Nīlakaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa, and the *Śukranītisāra* make a similar attempt to provide a budget of expenditure for the state. According to Someśvaradeva the total income should be divided into four parts; three-fourth of the income should be spent on the promotion of piety (*dharma*), material resources (*artha*) and worldly pleasures (*kāma*), and one-fourth should be kept into the treasury as reserve because the lack of resources impoverishes a man.[142] The *Śivadharma* and Hemādri divide the royal income into five parts, of which three-fifth are to be spent on personal uses and two-fifth on pious works.[143] A most detailed budgetory provision is attempted by the *Śukranītisāra.*[144]

---

[130] *Agni,* 226.12-13, 241.59 and 62, 245.27, etc.
[131] III. 145.3.
[132] *Agni,* chapts.218-9.
[133] *Ibid.,* 269.38-39.
[134] *Ibid.,* chapts.149, 164, 263-4, etc.
[135] *Ibid.,* chapt.68.
[136] *Ibid.,* 268.3-12.
[137] *Ibid.,* 268.13-16.
[138] *Ibid.,* 268. 16-31.
[139] *Ibid.,* 222.14.
[140] *CII,* IV, No.31 Añjaneri Plates of Bhogaśakti: K.E. 461 (A. D. 709-10 or 710-11).
[141] *Agni,* 223.13-14: *koṣe praveśayedardhaṁ nityaṁ chārdhaṁ dvije dadet.*

The *Agni Purāṇa* seems to be the first authority which hints at the formulation of a tentative budget, but we do not find any other example where half of the total revenue is sought to be disbursed among the brāhmaṇas. Hsüan Tsang[145] informs us that the royal revenues of Harṣavardhana were divided into four parts, the one for the expenses on administration and state worship, the second on high functionaries of the state, the third for rewards to learned persons, and the fourth for making gifts to various religious sects. Thus there were certain earlier ideas on the mode of expenditure, but the *Agni Purāṇa* does not adopt them completely.

---

[142] *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.543-4: *dharmārtha kāma siddhyarthaṁ kuryādbhāgatrayaṁ nṛpaḥ bhāgenaikena chāvaśyaṁ kāryaḥ kośasya sañchayaḥ* ... etc.

[143] *Dānamayūkha*, Banaras, 1909, p.5: *Śivadharme—tasmātribhāgaṁ vittasya jīvanāya prakalpayet. bhāgadvayaṁ tu dharmārthamanityam jīvitaṁ yataḥ. Hemādrī—sarvavittasya bhāgapañchakaṁ kṛtvā bhāgatrayaṁ jīvanārthaṁ bhāgadvayaṁ dharmārthaṁ*

[144] *Śukra.*, 1.316-7, 4.7, 27 and 29.

[145] Beal, S., *Travels of Hiouen-Thsang*, Vol.II, Calcutta, 1958, p. 142.

CHAPTER VI

ARMY AND INTER-STATE RELATIONS

If the states do harm to one another, it is considered to be war by the *Agni Purāṇa*.[1] It attributes the outbreak of hostility to one of the following causes: kidnapping of woman, territorial encroachment, attack on a check-post (*sthāna*)[2] or a district, challenge to wisdom, capture of soldiers, arrogance, pride, undue harassment, injury to sense (*jñāna*), tenacity (*ātmaśakti*), wounding religious susceptibilities and destruction of images and temples, humiliation of an ally, murder of a relative (*bandhuvināśa*), disturbance caused to the balance of power of the circle of states (*maṇḍaladūṣaṇaṁ*), and the conflict of desires to get the same thing.[3] It informs us that hostility between Rāma and Rāvaṇa took place on account of the kidnapping of Sītā,[4] the Bhārata war was the result of the aggrandisement at the cost of the Pāṇḍavas' territory, the disgrace done to their wife Draupadī, and of the arrogance and pride of the Kauravas;[5] similarly conflict between king Kārtavīrya and sage Jamadagni was the result of the capture of cattle wealth (*gograha*) by the former,[6] and that between Paraśurāma and kṣatriya families was on account of the murder of Jamadagni.[7] Sugrīva fought against Rāvaṇa for helping his ally Rāma.[8] No state worth its name can tolerate territorial aggression. We have many examples of battles fought for the preservation of *dharma* and temples in early medieval times. The Hindu kings of our period fought against the Muslims not only for the preservation of their territory but also of their faith and temples. The Arab traveller Sulaiman (A. D. 851) states that of all the princes of India the then king of Jurz (Gujarāt) is the greatest foe of the Mohammedan faith. Al Masudi speaks that his army of the north fights with Musalmans and the prince of Multan, and the army of the south fights with Balhāra, the king of Mānkīr (the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king of Mānyakheṭa), who is an ally of the Muslim invaders.[9] The kings did not shirk from fighting against an unrighteous Hindu king as well. The reply of Mūlarāja, the Chaulukya king of Aṇahilavāḍa, to the messenger of Graharipu, the king of Saurāṣṭra, is a fine example.[10] He said, "But Graharipu is unjust, he harasses the pilgrims and kills the Brāhmaṇas. No one can even move freely in Saurāṣṭra. He has destroyed the sacred Prabhāsa. He has raided peaceful towns. The son of a *mlechchha* woman, he has been hunting deer on the Girnār.[11] How can I make friends with such a sinner? Go and tell him to come and fight with me."

---

[1] *Agni*, 234.18; *Arth.*, 7.1; *KNS*, 10.1.
[2] *Supra*,
[3] *Agni*, 240.14-18; cf. *KNS*, 10.2-5.
[4] *Ibid.*, chapts.6-10.
[5] *Ibid.*, 13.18-28.
[6] *Ibid.*, 4.15-18 and 13.24.
[7] *Ibid.*, 4.17-19.
[8] *Ibid.*, chapt. 9.

We may add that the need for maintaining the balance of power and the policy of self-aggrandisement led to the famous tripartite struggle between the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the Pratīhāras and the Pālas.

The *Agni Purāṇa* advises the king to wage war against twenty types of persons.[12] It does not, however, favour sixteen types of war[13] such as those which are of little gain, of no gain, of doubtful result, those which create difficulties, those which are fought with enemy backed either by a mighty ally or by providence. It also does not like wars which yield little benefit at the outset but are of no avail in the long run, and wars which have a bad start but a good end. It states further that hostilities arising out of women, insulted allies, etc., tedious conflicts with brāhmaṇas not befitting the time, and out of the instigation of others are also to be avoided. Our text[14] concludes that the king should adopt the policy of war when he finds that it will be fruitful from the beginning to the end. Thus the *Agni Purāṇa* expects of the king a planning for war, and consideration of the pros and cons of the whole question of inter-state relations before starting hostile relationship. It seems to remember the advice of Kāmandaka,[15] who states that sometimes war brings total destruction.

At one place the *Agni Purāṇa* refers to the traditional fourfold division of the army;[16] at another it also makes diplomacy (*mantra*) and treasury (*koṣa*) a part of the army, which thus consists of six elements.[17] It points out that the foot-soldiers, the horsemen, the elephant-warriors, and the chariot-warriors constitute the army,[18] in the same manner as the two epics do. The basis of the sixfold army can be traced down to the six boards of military administration under the Mauryas,[19] although their number is raised to eight in the *Śānti Parva*.[20] However, the *Agni Purāṇa* borrows the idea of the sixfold army from Kāmandaka,[21] and following him it does not count the manual labourers as forming a corps of the army though their various duties are described. The references to the fourfold army by our text conforms to the continued popularity of the idea.[22] The addition of diplomacy and treasury is a result of the importance attached to them by our *Purāṇa*. The importance of finance in maintaining and equipping the army has always been felt. Today the big powers of the world are spending billions of dollars on devising new techniques and deterrents for war. We find that in spite of possessing the best army of the contemporary world the Romans met their doom at the hands of Visigoths, Lombards and Slavs because of the inability of their treasury 'to pay, equip and transport armies to take the field against them.'[23]

---

[9] *Early Arab Geographers,* Calcutta, 1956, pp.5, 29-30.

[10] *Gūrjara Deśa.,* Vol.I, p.166.

[11] Evidently a place of pilgrimage in our period. For reference see the *Gūrjara Deśa.,* Vol.II, p.365.

[12] *Agni,* 240.10-13.

[13] *Ibid.,* 240.20-24.

[14] *Ibid.,* 240.24: *tadātvāyatisaṁsuddhaṃ karma rājā sadā"charet.*

[15] *KNS,* 10.13: *kadāchidvigrahe puṁsāṃ sarvanāśastu jāyate.*

[16] *Agni,* 228.6; 234.15.

The *Agni Purāṇa* holds that the army consisting mainly of foot-soldiers is always victorious.[24] So it prefers an army which is numerically strong. In early times when weapons were crude and primitive, victory depended on the infantry who won it through their courage and numerical weight. According to our text the foot-soldiers are expected to carry the wounded and the dead, to supply food, water, etc.. to the soldiers and the elephants, and to transport arms and weapons.[25] So the infantry serves the purpose which is now served by the non-combatant commissariat corps. But the *Nītiprakāśikā* recommends that foot-soldiers should function as military guards to protect the treasury, the armoury and food supply depot, and to help in the formation of battle array.[26]

---

[17] *Ibid.*, 242.2: *ṣaḍaṅgam mantrakoṣābhyāṁ padātyaśvarathadvipaiḥ.*

[18] *Ibid.*, 7.10, 10.7, 14.9, 14.13.

[19] Mookerji, R. K., *Chandragupta Maurya and his times*, Second Edition, p.166.

[20] *Śānti.*, 58.41. It adds forced labourers, navy, spies and the local guides (*deśikāḥ*). The commentator on the *NP*, 1.55 supplies a slightly distorted verse replacing wrestlers (*yodhā*) for navy, and the absence of chariot makes the list of only seven. *Yathā* should read *rathā*. *Udyoga*, 96.16, *Śānti.*, 103.38; *Manu*, 7.185 adds *koṣa* and *yantra* to the four arms.

[21] *KNS*, 18.24.

[22] *VDP*, I. 18.15 ; *Matsya*, 239.21 ; *Yukti.*, p.6; *Abhilaṣi.*, I.2.680 ; *Nītimayūkha*, p.81 ; *CII*, IV, No.56 Khairha Plate of Yasaḥkarṇa (A. D. 1072) ; 1.8, *chaturaṅgachamū* ; *EI*. XX,p.119 ; *Ibid.*, XXII,p.155 ; *EC*, VIII,p.103 and p.131, etc.

[23] Spaulding, Nickerson and Wright, *Warfare*, Infantry Journal Press, Washington, D. C. 1937, p.267.

[24] *Agni*, 228.7: *senā padātibahulā śatruñjayati sarvadā* ; *Matsya*, 239.21.

[25] *Ibid.*, 236.44-45, 242.27 ; *VDP*, II. 177.43-44 ; *KNS*, 19.5.

The *Agni Purāṇa* speaks of foot-soldiers (*pattis*), shielded soldiers (*charmin*), archers (*dhanvin*) and the forced labourers (*viṣṭi*), all of whom probably constitute the infantry brigade (*padātibala*). The shielded warriors are to protect the soldiers of their side, and to kill the enemies and their (enemies') wounded soldiers.[27] They perhaps carry swords and other weapons, in contrast to the archers, who fight with only bow and arrow to make the enemies reel back.[28] The forced labourers are to be employed to clear roads and construct camps.[29] Our *Purāṇa* states that the foot-soldiers are most effective where the ground is uneven. The other contemporary opinions agree with this view.[30] However, it quotes Kāmandaka[31] that a battle ground full of ant-hills, stones and thorns, trees without foliage and undulating plain is not suitable. Therefore the first view expressed in the *Agni Purāṇa* seems to be later and popular. Al Masudi informs us that Balhāra, the king of Mānkīr, possessed innumerable troops, mainly infantry, because his territory was mountainous.[32] The Roman emperor Maurice (A.D. 582-602), in his famous treatise the *Strategicon*, ordains that the foot-soldiers are expected to play the leading rôle where the movements of cavalry are difficult,[33] and points out the example of the Slav army which were all infantry and therefore formidable because of the difficult nature of their country.[34]

The importance attached to the infantry by the *Agni Purāṇa* is supported by Hsüan Tsang,[35] who states that mobility of the foot-soldiers contributes to the defence of the kingdom. According to Bhoja,[36] as all are dependent on the infantry it is the infantry which really constitutes the army. He bases his view on the argument that foot-soldiers can be employed everywhere and even in those places where the manoeuverability of other corps is doubtful.

---

[26] *NP*, 6.67.

[27] *Agni*, 236.46 ; cf. *VDP*, II. 177.45.

[28] *Ibid.*, 236.47: *vimukhikaraṇaṁ yuddhe dhanvināṁ cha tathochyate.*

[29] *Ibid.*, 242.27. Here the term *basti* should read *viṣṭi* as in the *KNS* (TSS), 20.7 ; *NP*, 6 66.

[30] *Ibid.*, 236.49: *pattibhurviṣamā jñeyā ; VDP*, II. 177.49 ; *Śānti.*, 100.23-25.

[31] *Ibid.*, 242.28; *KNS*, 19.9; cf. *NP*, 6.68.

[32] *Early Arab Geographers*, p.26.

[33] Spaulding, Nickerson and Wright, *op.cit.*, p.271.

[34] *Ibid.*, p.268.

[35] Beal. *Travels of Hiouen-Thsang*, Vol.II, p.139.

[36] *Yukti.*, p.7. vv. 46-47: *padātayastu sarvvatra balaṁ syāt pṛthivībhūjaḥ,*

The *Agni Purāṇa* informs us that the king requests his steed to be his conveyance and to bestow on him victory in the battle.[37] The king further reminds the horse of its divine origin and of the gods' victory over the demons through it.[38] This probably alludes to the Aryans' victory over ther non-Aryans through the use of horse. The *Agni Purāṇa* devotes three chapters to the enumeration of good and bad signs of horse, its various movements and its different diseases,[39] and provides for the appointment of the superintendent of horses.[40] All this goes to show the weight given to horses in our time.

The *Agni Purāṇa*[41] lays down the following duties for a mounted soldier, to reconnoitre the forest and the road, to protect the transport and supply, to cover the rear of the retreating army, to execute a work quickly, to chase the retreating soldiers of his enemy and to kill them in thousands. The *Nītiprakāśikā* describes similar duties of the horsemen. So it is the swiftness of the horse that is valued in these matters. Somadeva Sūrī[42] states that the cavalry represents the mobility required in an army,—a view supported by Someśvaradeva,[43] who adds that the cavalry brings under control even a far-situated enemy and promotes the glory and stability of the state.

Our text states that the elephants form the chief beauty of the camp and the army.[44] But it contains fifty-seven verses dealing with the good and bad points of the elephant, his diet, medicines for his treatment, etc.,[45] as against one hundred and thirty verses describing the auspicious asterisms and suitable and unsuitable seasons for their use, the auspicious signs of horses, their varieties, their diseases and medicines, etc.[46]

---

rājñā yuddhāya yujyeta yadanyadvividhaṁ balaṁ, sarvaṁ pattibalādhīnaṁ tasmātpatti balaṁ balaṁ.

[37] *Agni,* 288.13-19.

[38] *Ibid.,* 288.19: *tava pṛṣṭhaṁ samārūhya hatā daityāḥ suraipurāḥ.*

[39] *Ibid.,* chapts.288-90.

[40] *Ibid.,* 220.7.

[41] *Ibid.,* 242.25-26 ; cf. *KNS,* 19.4-5 ; *NP,* 6.64-65.

[42] *NVA,* 22.7: *aśvabalaṁ sainyasya jaṅgamaṁ prakāraḥ.*

[43] *Abhilaṣi.,* I. 2.577-8 ; cf. *NVA,* 22.8.

[44] *Agni,* 287.5-6.

[45] *Ibid.,* chapts.287 and 291.

[46] *Ibid.,* chapts.288-90.

The *Agni Purāṇa* discusses the method of training horses but not elephants. Moreover, possession of horse is considered to be useful not only for war, as is the case with elephants, but also for the realisation of three aims of life: piety (*dharma*), wealth (*artha*) and enjoyment (*kāma*).[47] So our text thinks it more advantageous to maintain horses, and considers elephants to be mainly of decorative value.

The *Viṣṇudharmottara*[48] supports the view of the *Agni Purāṇa* and adds that cavalry is the chief limb of the army and is the best conveyance for covering long distances. The horse is lavishly praised by the contemporary *Aśvāyurveda* of Gaṇa,[49] who elaborates the Purāṇic view on the question. He points out that the person who possesses good horses becomes the lord of the whole earth touching the sea, and that there is no better means to gain victory than through horses; works which need immediate attention can neither be performed by elephants nor by foot-soldiers but by the horsemen; the action of the cavalier is magic-like, and an army devoid of horses falls like a tree without a root.

The early Arab geographers state that Bhoja maintained the finest cavalry of India.[50] The king of Rahmā, state Sulaiman and Al-Masudi, possessed more troops, elephants and horses than other contemporary great kings of India such as Balhāra, king of Jurz (Juzr), and the king of Tafāk (Tafan).[51] The Pāla king received horses as presents from the kings of the north.[52] The Chaulukyas imported ten thousand horses annually through the port of Cambay alone.[53] The king of Malabar strengthened his cavalry by importing 11,400 strong Arab horses annually.[54] So during our period, we find a craze among the Indian princes to enrich their army with the best Arab horses. If we are to believe Rashidu-d-din, the import of horses would have cost the state exchequer much, as each horse was sold at 220 *dināṛs* of current red gold.[55]

[47] *Ibid.*, 288.1.

[48] Quoted by the *Lakṣaṇaprakāśa*, p.404: *pradhānamaṅgaṁ sainyasya śobhā cha paramā hayāḥ*, etc.

[49] *Ibid.*, pp.404-6: *tasya sāgaraparyantā haste tiṣṭhati medinī, indrajālikavattiṣṭhetko'nyaṁ muktvā turaṅgamam, ... aśvairvihīnāḥ pātyante chhinnamūlā iva drumāḥ.*

[50] *Early Arab Geographers*, pp. 5 and 32.

[51] *Ibid.*, p.6 and 32, Rahmā of the accounts of Sulaiman and Al-Masudi is identified with the Pāla territory.

[52] *EI.* IV, p.243ff. Khalimpur Copper Plate of Dharmapāla.

[53] *Gūrjara Deśa.*, Vol.II, p.416.

[54] *Early Arab Geographers*, p.97.

[55] As above.

Wide use of cavalry in the army of our time gets also epigraphic support. The Pāla and the Pratīhāra kings assumed the title of 'the lord of horses (*aśvapati*), along with other epithets.[56] Officers in charge of horses called *aśvasādhanika* or *mahāśvasādhanika* enjoyed an important place in the administrative set-up.[57] The Kasia Stone Inscription (c. 10th century) speaks of 'hundreds of the hoofs of the numerous galloping horses' of the Kalachuri king Bhimaṭa II.[58] The Rewa Stone Inscription of Karṇa (A.D. 1048-49)[59] mentions his hostile army (Gurjara) being 'inaccessible on account of horses.' His second inscription found at the same place of the Kalachuri Era 812 (A.D. 1060) refers to the famous battle of horses (*ghoṭaka vigraha*) fought and won by his commander Vappulla.[60] The Rewa Stone Inscription of Vijayasiṁha (A.D. 1193) credits his feudatory Malayasiṁha[61] with maintaining an ocean of horses and employing an officer to take care of horses, religion, education, and treasury.

Thus the *Agni Purāṇa* supported by literary and epigraphic evidences together with the accounts of the Arab merchants goes to refute the view of P.C. Chakravarti that 'the cavalry never came to occupy' the front rank in the army organisation of ancient India'.[62]

Alberuni[63] states that saddle was not generally used in India in the 11th century, but our *Purāṇa* does not favour the riding of a horse without saddle and bridle. It states that only experts should ride without them.[64] Secondly, we find that our text prescribes the use of defensive armour (*urastrāṇa*) for war horses. It was used in our time as can be inferred from contemporary literary and numismatic sources.[65] Thirdly, in the chapters on the science of archery (*dhanurveda*) the *Agni Purāṇa* refers to the training in horse-archery and adds that it should follow training in other aspects of archery. It lays down further that a bow of three cubits is generally used by foot-soldiers, horse-troopers, car-warriors, and by soldiers mounted on elephants. The *Viṣṇudharmottara*, the *Aśvāyurveda* of Gaṇa and the *Vīrachintāmaṇī Dhanurveda* hold a similar view.[66] All this naturally goes against Chakravarti's claim that 'there is scarcely a reference to Indian horse-archers' in post-Gupta time.[67]

---

[56] *CII*, IV, Intro., clxxxviii.

[57] *Ibid.*, No.48, *l.*36 ; No.50, *l.*37 ; No.56, *ll.*.25-26.

[58] *Ibid.*, No.73, verse 30.

[59] *Ibid.*, No.51, verse 28.

[60] *Ibid.*, No.53, verse 9.

[61] *Ibid.*, Pt.I, No. 67, verse 19 and verse 29; *dharmasya vidyākayakośalekhī...*

[62] *AWAI*, p.36.

[63] *Alberuni's India*, Vol.I, p. 181.

[64] *Agni*, 188.6-7.

[65] *Ibid.*, 288.33 ; *Rājataraṅgiṇī* 8.728; *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.1187. For other literary and numismatic references consult P. C. Chakravarti's *The Art of War in Ancient India*, p.40.

The *Agni Purāṇa* states that elephants are a decoration of the camp and the army, and they bring the desired victory to the king.[68] A similar view is expressed by Kauṭilya, Kāmandaka, Pālakapya and the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, and in early medieval times by Somadeva Sūri, Someśvaradeva, the *Budhabhūṣaṇa* and the *Śāraṅgadharapaddhati*.[69] We have seen elsewhere that elephants lost their old military value in our period to horses, and it may be ascribed to their failure against the Arab and Turkish archers.[70] The view is supported by Somadeva Sūri,[71] who opines that instead of procuring victory an untrained elephant destroys life and property on his own side.

However, in spite of all the drawbacks, the elephant force continued to play an important rôle in the army organisation of the early medieval period. Kings assumed the title of the lord of elephants (*gajapati*),[72] and inscriptions of the period refer to the maintenance of elephant corps by the kings.[73] The Arab merchants state that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa, Pāla and the Pratīhāra kings maintained huge elephant corps.[74]

The *Agni Purāṇa* states that during rains only infantry and the elephant corps can effectively be employed in the battlefield, and the summer is the worst season for battle with elephants.[75] Other texts support this view.[76]

---

[66] *VDP*, II. 179.30, II. 180.17-18 and II. 181.1; *Lakṣaṇaprakāśa*, p.406 and p.292: *rathasthena gajasthena hayasthena padātinā, dhāvatā vai śramaḥ kāryo lakṣayaṁ hantuṁ suniśchitaṁ.*

[67] *AWAI*, p.42.

[68] *Agni*, 287.5-6.

[69] *Arth.*, 2.2. 7.11; *KNS*, 15.10-12, 19.61-62; *Hastyāurveda*, ASS. 1894, I. 5.23 and 29; *VDP*, II. 49.1-2; *NVA*, 22.2-3; *Yaśas.*, III. p.491; *Budhabhūṣaṇa* quoted by Kane, *HDS*, Vol.III. p.203; *Sāraṅgadharapaddhati*, Kāvyamālā Series, Ed. Paterson, p.249.

[70] *AWAI*, pp.50-51, King Harṣa of Kāśmīra, Dāhira of Sindh, the Hindu Śāhi king Ānandapāla, etc. lost their battles on account of the confusion created in their ranks by wounded elephants.

[71] *NVA*, 22.5.

[72] *CII*, IV, Introduction, p.clxxxviii.

[73] *Ibid.*, No.74, v.13; No.82, vv.19, 22 and 29; No.84, v.18; No.88, v.11; No.100, v.25; Nos.103-4, etc.

[74] *Early Arab Geographers*, pp.26 and 32.

The *Agni Purāṇa* finds the utility of the elephant corps in breaking through the line of the enemy, destroying the enemy's regiment, dispersing the hostile deep array, dismantling the walls, the turrets and the battlements, and breaking down the boughs of trees.[77] It adds that elephants help to make passage to forests and forts, to gather the scattered army round himself and to protect the treasury.[78] This is in line with Kauṭilya and Kāmandaka.[79] The *Agni Purāṇa* adds further that the elephant corps is the mainstay of an army engaged in a confused war (*mahāsaṁkula yuddha*).[80] The discussion of the duties of the elephant corps shows that it is favoured for their size and strength.

The *Agni Purāṇa* lays down that the elephant should be mounted by two soldiers with goad (*aṅkuśa*), one on his neck and the other on his shoulder, two archers, and two swordsmen.[81] To this the *Viṣṇudharmottara*[82] adds a flag-staff holder, who is to sit in the rear. The two hookmen seem to act as alternate driver. So an elephant carries six or seven soldiers. In the earlier period their number was generally four; three fighters and one driver.[83] Even in our time Someśvaradeva[84] differs from the view of our text, and recommends only two warriors for an elephant. The manoeuvrability of arms by soldiers on its back seems to be the guiding factor. Sometimes the elephant carried the war-drummer, probably to announce the beginning of war and to give impetus to the soldiers.[85]

The *Agni Purāṇa* knows of some officials connected with the elephant corps. They are superintendents of elephants (*gajādhyakṣa*),[86] elephant trainer (*hastipa*),[87] elephant-doctor (*hastivaidya*).[88]

[75] *Agni*, 228.5-6.
[76] *Matsya*, 239.20-21, etc.
[77] *Agni*, 236.48-49 ; cf. *VDP*, II. 177.48.
[78] *Ibid.*, 242.23-24.
[79] *Arth.*, 10.4 ; *KNS*, 19.1-3.
[80] *Agni*, 242.36-37.
[81] *Ibid.*, 252.31.
[82] II. 183.22-24.
[83] *AWAI*, p.52.
[84] *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.1181-82 and 1196-1200.
[85] *Agni*, 291.23-24.
[86] *Ibid.*, 220.6 and 291.24.
[87] *Ibid.*, 291.24 and 366.10.
[88] *Ibid.*, 291.14.

While discussing the appropriate land and the season for the use of chariots in the battlefield, the *Agni Purāṇa* states that the land should be neither marshy nor uneven.[89] As for the battle order, the chariots are placed just behind the horse-troopers and in front of the elephants.[90] It is laid down that three horses should be employed to guard a chariot, or an elephant.[91] If we compare this statement of our text with its another that guards of nine elephants should be employed to guard a chariot,[92] we may conclude that the first statement is later than the second, and that it relegates the chariot to a secondary position. To overawe the enemy and to act as the rallying point of the allies[93] are not considered to be the important functions of the chariot.

The *Agni Purāṇa* discusses the method of training foot-soldiers, horse-troopers, the good and bad qualities of horses and elephants, but there is not the slightest reference to the construction and equipment of a good chariot. It describes the ceremonial waving of lights (*nirājana*) to various arms and weapons, the horse and the elephant, and to the banner, but the chariot is ignored by our text.[94] The *Agni Purāṇa*[95] enjoins the king to appoint superintendents of horses, elephants, armoury, and of forts, but does not provide for the appointment of such an officer in charge of chariots as Kauṭilya does.[96] So it seems to suppor our general belief that chariots went into disuse from the eighth century onwards.[97]

There are some occasional references to the fourfold army and the king being trained in the art of chariot-fight, but the general tone of the literature and the inscriptions of our time point otherwise. Bāṇa describes the war preparations but does not refer to the chariots. From the inscriptions it seems that contemporary kings assumed such titles as 'lord of foot-soldiers (*narapati*)', 'lord of horses (*hayapati* or *aśvapati*)', and the 'lord of elephants (*gajapati*)', but we do not come across any king who is called lord of chariots. Furthermore, we find officers in charge of horses (*aśvasādhanika*, *mahāśvasādhanika*) or of elephants

---

[89] *Ibid.*, 236.49 ; 242.30.
[90] *Ibid.*, 236.39.
[91] *Ibid.*, 252.32.
[92] *Ibid.*, 242.39.
[93] *Ibid.*, 236.38 ; 242.25.
[94] *Ibid.*, chapts 268-9.
[95] *Ibid.*, chapt.220.
[96] *Arth.*, 2.33.
[97] *AWAI*, pp.25-27.

(*mahāpramattavāra*)[98] but officer or warrior in charge of chariots (*rathī* or *mahārathī*) do not figure in our period. The Rewa Stone Inscription of Karṇa, K. E. 800 (A. D. 1048-49),[99] the Rajim Stone Inscription of king Pṛthivīdeva II, K.E. 896 (A.D. 1145),[100] the Rewa Plate of Vijayasiṁha, V.E. 1253 (A. D. 1195),[101] the Sheorinarayana Inscription of Jājalladeva II, K.E. 919 (A.D. 1167-68)[102] describe the other three traditional divisions of army but not the chariots. The *Yuktikalpataru*[103] describes various types of conveyances except chariot. Similar is the case with the *Lakṣaṇaprakāśa*. So we may conclude that the treatment of chariots by the *Agni Purāṇa* is only theoretical to make the picture complete, and the chariots do not really play any part in the military history of our time.

The *Agni Purāṇa* provides another sixfold classification of the army, based on the sources of their recruitment. The six kinds of soldiers are: hereditary soldiers (*maula*), newly recruited or the mercenaries (*bhūta*), guild-levies (*śreṇi*), soldiers supplied by the allies (*suhṛd*), soldiers captured in war or won over from enemy's side (*dviṣat*), and those recruited from forest tribes (*āṭavika*).[104] Our text states that they are relatively important according to the order of enumeration. Similar is the case with their weaknesses.[105] It does not attempt to assign reasons for their relative importance as is done by Kauṭilya and Kāmandaka.[106] A gradation of the different types of soldiers slightly different from our text is attempted by Someśvaradeva.[107] According to him the hereditary, the new recruits and the allied force constitute the best part of the army. It is followed by the guild-force. The foresters constitute the third category, and the soldiers coming from the enemy's side are the worst and never to be trusted.

The *Agni Purāṇa* advises the king to maintain the import of soldiers (*balādāna*).[108] It seems that the institution of mercenary soldiers was prominent in our period. People of different regions specialised themselves in fighting with different weapons and were recruited by the kings. Literary and epigraphic references support our view. The *Viṣṇudharmottara*[109] states that the people of the south are expert in fight with shields and swords, the people of Vaṅkala (?) and mountainous region in archery, and the hilly tribes in fight with slings (stones). It adds that the inhabitants of Pañchāla and Śūrasena are expert charioteers, of Kamboja and Gandhāra expert horsemen, the people of Prāyaśa (?) and the mlechchhas fight well with noose (*pāśa*), and the people of Aṅga, Vaṅga and Kaliṅga fight with elephants. The *Chāchanāmā*[110] of the 8th century informs us that five hundred Arab soldiers were employed by king Dāhir of Sindh. The *Rājataraṅgiṇī*[111] states that the kings of Kāśmīra recruited soldiers from Rajaputana, Sindh, Panjab, Magadha as well as from amongst the Yavanas and the Turuṣkas. The *Yaśastilaka*[112] suggests the existence of five divisions of mercenaries in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa army: the Dramila (Deccan) expert in litters, the North Indian cavalry, the Gurjara regiment of archers, the Tairabhukta (Tirhut) regiment proficient in warfare conducted by the navy and elephants, and the undisciplined Gauḍa (Bengal) corps. The rulers of the Maurya race, according to the Kaṇaśva Inscription of Śivagaṇa (A.D. 738-9),[113] recruited their army from distant regions. The Pāla inscriptions[114] inform us that Gauḍas, Mālavas, Hūṇas, Kulikas, Karṇāṭas and Lāṭas were employed as soldiers in the Pāla army.

---

[98] *CII*, IV, Introduction, p.cxliii.
[99] *Ibid.*, No.50, verse 28.
[100] *Ibid.*, No.88, verse 11.
[101] *Ibid.*, No.68, line 2.
[102] *Ibid.*, No.98, verse 25.
[103] *Yukti.*, p. 7, verse 49 ; cf. *Ibid.*, pp.215-229.
[104] *Agni*, 241.43 ; 242.1, *śroṇi* in this case is the wrong form of *śreṇi*.
[105] *Ibid.*, 242.2: *pūrvaṁ pūrvaṁ gariyastu balānaṁ vyasanaṁ tathā*.
[106] *Arth.*, 9.2 ; *KNS*, 18.4-9.
[107] *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.560-64.
[108] *Agni*, 239.45.

The *Agni Purāṇa* states that a brave hero is generally tall, possesses an acquiline nose, large eyes, blended eye-brows as well as excitability and fondness of war. So it seems to suggest these qualities as a prerequisite for appointment in the army. Caste also forms the basis of military recruitment. It enumerates the good qualities of the army and includes the preponderance of the kṣatriya caste as one of them.[115] The

---

[109] *VDP*, II. 177.40-43.

[110] Elliot, *History of India as told by her own Historians*, Vol.I, p.156.

[111] *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, 7.1149, 1501 and 1868 ; 82.2264.

[112] Handiqui, *op. cit.* pp.96-97.

[113] *IA*, XIX, p.58: *durābhyāgatavāhinī parikara...*

[114] Choudhary, R. K.. *Select Inscriptions of Bihar*, Nalanda Copper Plate of Dharmapāla, 1.14 ; Monghyr Copper Plate of Devapāla, (year 33), 1.36 ; Nalanda Copper Plate of Devapāladeva (year 39), ll.31-32 ; Bhagalpur Copper Plate Grant of Nārāyaṇapāla, 1.36 ; Banagaon Copper Plate of Vigrahapāla, III (year 17), 1.30.

[115] *Agni*, 236.43.

Agni Purāṇa lays down that military training should be imparted by two higher castes.[116] Though our text prefers an army of the kṣatriyas like Kauṭilya and Kāmandaka,[117] it allows the brāhmaṇas to adopt the function of the kṣatriyas as an emergency source of their livelihood[118] and reserves the post of the commander-in-chief to the brāhmaṇas and kṣatriyas.[119] This provision presumably restricts the appointment of others as regular soldiers. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* strictly prohibits the appointment of śūdras as teachers of military science, though the rule forbiding the vaiśyas to act as such is not rigid.[120] However, the *Agni Purāṇa* along with the *Viṣṇudharmottara* shows an amount of liberalism towards castes other than the brāhmaṇas and the kṣatriyas. Though the *Agni Purāṇa* is completely silent over the military rights of the vaiśyas, it lays down that if the śūdras get themselves trained, they acquire the right to fight in the battle. It further lays down that even the mixed castes of the country should help the king in war, and so in this respect it is more liberal than the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, which does not include the mixed castes.[121] We may conclude that the *Agni Purāṇa* is as liberal in allowing military rights as political rights to persons of the lower strata of society. This may have been necessitated by the frequent inter-state wars as well as the Muslim invasions in our time.

Epigraphic records of our time show that brāhmaṇas were actually appointed as commander-in-chief and they showed military talents in the field. Chakravarti[122] has gathered ten such examples, but we might add a few more.[123] Halāyudha, in his commentary on the *Chhandaśāstra* of Piṅgala, describes his patron the Paramāra king Muñja as a brahma-kṣatra or a brāhmaṇa, adopting the profession of kṣatriya.[124] As regards the vaiśyas, we have a separate division of army composed of soldiers supplied by the guilds (traders and merchants). With the growth of trade and commerce from the Gupta period onwards, the traders may have gained ample military strength. We have the example of the Vīra-Valañjiyas, who supplied soldiers to the Choḷas as well as to the kings of Ceylon.[125] Some late inscriptions from Chhattisgarh describe the victorious pursuits and the bravery shown by Vallabharāja, a vaiśya feudatory of the Kalachuris of Ratanpur.[126] Then we have the following proud words of Vastupāla, a great warrior under the Chaulukya king Lavaṇaprasāda: "Messenger! It is a delusion to think that the Kṣhatriyas alone can fight, and not a *Vaṇik*. Did not Ambaḍa, a *Vaṇik*, kill Mallikārjuna in battle? I, a *Vaṇik* am as well-known in the shop as on the battlefield. I buy commodities—the heads of enemies—weighing them in the scales of swords; I will get the price in the form of heaven."[127] The Kāśmīra and the Hoysala army consisted of persons of lower orders.[128] We have the illustrious example of Vaṇḍurāja, a śūdra general, of Kulottuṅga I Choḷa.[129] Furthermore, the descendents of Gollāka alias Gauḍa, of the kāyastha (śūdra) caste, served the Kalachuris with their military prowess as well as counsel.[130] The Tippera Copper Plate of Lokanātha (A. D. 750 or 663-4 ?) informs us of the appointment of Keśava, belonging to the mixed caste, as an army general.[131] Provision for the recruitment of all castes in the army, enunciated by our *Purāṇa*, is also found in the *Śukranīti*.[132]

---

[116] *Ibid.*, 249.7, same as in the VDP, II. 178.10: *dhanurvede gururvipraḥ prokto varṇadvayasya cha.*

[117] *Supra.* cf. *Arth.*, 6.1.

[118] *Agni*, 152.1 ; cf. *Manu.* 10.81 ; *Yāj.*, 3.35.

[119] *Ibid.*, 220.1.

[120] *VDP*, II. 178.11.

[121] *Agni*, 249.18: *yuddhādhikāraḥ śūdrasya svayaṁ cha'padi sikṣayā, deśasthaiḥ śaṁkarai rājñaḥ kāryā yuddhe sahāyatā* ; cf. *VDP*, II. 178.11-12.

[122] *AWAI*, pp.79-82.

[123] *Gūrjara Desa.*, Vol.II. p.306. The epithet of '*gurjara-brahma-senāni*' was enjoyed by Ambāprasāda, the *mahāmātya* under Chaulukya king Jayasiṁha.

[124] *Chhandaśāstraṁ* with the commentary of Halāyudha, Kāvyamālā Series, p.34.

Like ancient and contemporary texts, the *Agni Purāṇa*[133] emphasises regular payment to soldiers, but it does not lay down the rates of pay and allowances as done in the *Arthaśāstra*, the *Nītiprakāśikā* and summarily by the *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi*.[134] The Arab merchant Sulaiman[135] informs us that as among the Arabs payment of salary was regularly made in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa army. Mihira Bhoja regularly paid his vast army.[136] The *Agni Purāṇa* does not refer to the grant of military fief as stated by Hsüan Tsang[137] and suggested by Someśvaradeva,[138] though we have epigraphic evidence for the prevalence of the practice.[139]

---

[125] *AWAI*, pp.6-7.
[126] *CII*, IV, Introduction, p.clxviii, Nos.84, 85, 87 and 95.
[127] *Gūrjara Deśa.*, Vol.II, p.388.
[128] *AWAI*, p.82.
[129] *EI*, XXVII, p.139.
[130] *CII*, IV, Introduction, p.clxviii ; No.51, Rewa Stone Inscription of Karṇa, (A. D. 1048-49).
[131] *HB*. Vol.I, Ed. R. C. Majumdar, Dacca, 1942, p.575.
[132] 2.279-80: *śūdra vā kṣatriya vaiśya mlechchhāḥ śaṁkarasaṁbhavāḥ, senādhipaḥ sainikaścha kāryā rājñā jayārthinā.*
[133] *Agni*, 139.31 ; *Sabhāparva*, 5.48-49 ; *Arth.*, 8.5 ; *KNS*, 4.65 ; *NVA*, 22.17 ; *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.570-71.
[134] *Arth.*, 5.3 ; *NP*, 7.33-43 ; *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.570-73.
[135] *Early Arab Geographers*, p.4.

The *Agni Purāṇa* enumerates as many as fourteen points of excellence in an army. A good army should be hereditary, loyal, compact, regularly paid, and belong to families famous for bravery. Besides, it should contain well-trained soldiers, expert in the use of various arms and weapons, heroes of many battles, abound in brave persons and such elephants and heroes as have been shown lights for being sent to the battlefield. The text lays down further that the soldiers should be mainly kṣatriyas and they should be capable of facing the troubles of living in distant lands and of showing fortitude. Similar qualities of a good army are described by Kāmandaka.[140]

The *Agni Purāṇa* points out the various factors which weaken the army. It stresses that the army should not be in any respect obstructed, scattered, dishonoured and insulted, and it should not be disease-stricken and tired. Our *Purāṇa* adds further that it should not be one, coming from afar, newly arrived, thinned in ranks, disgusted, shattered, mutually jealous and leaderless. On the one hand its vanguard should be strong, on the other hand the rear should not be inimical. Thus great emphasis is laid on keeping the army well-contented, compact, well-trained and in a state of readiness. The weaknesses of the army mentioned by our text is in complete agreement with Kāmandaka's view,[141] the latter, however, provides remedies for some of these defects,[142]

The *Agni Purāṇa*[143] quotes the *Amarakośa* to describe the various units of the army, which are the same as in the *Ādiparva* of the *Mahā-*

---

[136] *Gūrjara Deśa.*, Vol.I, p.123.

[137] Beal, *Travels of Hiouen-Thsang*, Vol.II, p.142.

[138] *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.571.

[139] *EI*, IX, p.72 ; XI, pp.43-46, etc. ; I, a grant of 750 villages to a chief by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa ; V, p.134 ; Bandyopadhyaya, N. C., *Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories*, pp.268-9 , *AWAI*, pp.89-91.

[140] *Agni*, 239.31-33 ; cf. *KNS*, 4.65-67.

[141] *Ibid.*, 241.30-33 ; cf. *KNS*, 13.67-72.

[142] *KNS*, 13.72-90.

[143] *Agni*, 366.12-14 ; cf. *Ādiparva*, 2.19ff.; *Amar.*, (*Kṣatriyavarga*), vv.80-81.

bhārata. They are nine in total. The composition of these units together with their gradation, according to our text, is as follows:—

S. No.	Unit	Chariot	Elephant	Horse	Foot Soldiers
1	*patti*	1	1	3	5
2	*senāmukha*	3	3	9	15
3	*gulma*	9	9	27	45
4	*gaṇa*	27	27	81	135
5	*vāhinī*	81	81	243	405
6	*pṛtanā*	243	243	729	1215
7	*chamū*	729	729	2187	3645
8	*anīkini*	2187	2187	6561	10935
9	*akṣauhiṇi*	21870	21870	65610	109350

This scheme seems to be only theoretical because the *Mahābhārata,*[144] where it originally occurs, does not follow this uniformly. The *Nītiprakāśikā*[145] increases the numerical strength of various units, which does not seem to be trustworthy.

However, the theoretical division of the army known from our text was popular till the early 11th century as indicated by Alberuni[146]. We, however, do not find any epigraphic reference to the army divisions.

Our *Purāṇa*[147] does not speak of any officer in charge of these units except the head of a *chamū,* who is here taken in a general sense to mean the army commander.[148] Besides it speaks of the *senāpati,* the *nāyaka* and the *balādhyakṣa.*[149] Kauṭilya[150] places the *nāyaka* over ten *senāpatis,* but our text seems to suggest that the *senāpati* is a higher officer than the *nāyaka,* and is in overall charge of the army in the

[144] *Śānti.,* 100.31 ; *Udyoga.,* 154-24-29.
[145] *NP,* 7.19-31, cf. 7.5.
[146] *Alberuni's India,* Vol.I. pp.407-8.
[147] *Agni,* 14.11.
[148] *Ibid.,* 242.3-4, 242.43 and 45 ; 106.10.
[149] *Arth.,* 10.6.
[150] *Agni,* 241.44, 242.3 and 242.6.

battlefield.[151] Among all the military officers the requisite qualifications of only the *senāpati* are enumerated, and likewise prize for killing him is specifically mentioned.[152] Other military officers are ignored probably on account of their lesser importance. So the *senāpati* seems to be the commander-in-chief.

According to the *Agni Purāṇa* the king should lead his army in the battlefield, but at the same time he is asked to be in the middle of the advancing column. This view is in keeping with Kāmandaka. However, in an another passage it asks the king to be two miles away from the fighting line and not to engage himself in actual combat. This is attributed to the fact that the death of the king will mean complete destruction of the army.[153] An identical view is expressed by the *Viṣṇudharmottara*[154] and the *Yuktikalpataru*.[155] So it seems that in early medieval time the king was not supposed to be directly concerned with actual fight, which was the responsibility of his functionaries and feudatories. The *Agni Purāṇa* speaks of war conducted by the high officers (*amātyen kṛte raṇe*).[156]

The king, his officers, the crown prince and the army commanders are assigned the management of the military affairs. Besides, military department is instructed to employ astrologers, the priests, and persons expert in prognostication. They are to advise the king in selecting auspicious time for starting a military campaign, reading the future of the war,[157] and performing religious rituals before the start of the expedition and device of the route-march.[158] Our text seems to recommend the employment of flag-bearers and war-drummers in the battlefield.[159] The king is advised to appoint superintendents of forts and arsenal,[160] and teachers of military science who evidently are to be attached to the war department.

The forts played an important part in the defence scheme of ancient times. The *Agni Purāṇa*[161] claims to give a separate chapter to the subject, but the chapter contains some extraneous matter. It advises the king to reside in a fortified city, consisting mainly of productive and servile castes, labourers, artisans, and a few brāhmaṇas. The city, according to it, should be well-watered and not dependent on rain, rich in agricultural products, impassable for the invaders and free from external and internal dangers. The *Agni Purāṇa* enjoins that the fort should contain the capital (*pura*), markets, temples, arms, weapons, and different medicines, and be surrounded by a moat of water.[162] It further lays down that the king may choose any of the six varieties of forts.[163] Like the *Arthaśāstra*, the *Matsya*, and the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, it states that the hill-fortress is the best on account of its impregnability.[164] We have numerous examples of hill-fortress during the early medieval period.[165]

---

[151] *Ibid.*, 220.1 and 242.35.
[152] *Ibid.*, chapts.236 and 241-2 ; cf. *KNS*, 19.15-16.
[153] *Ibid.*, 236.33.
[154] II. 177.23-24.
[155] p.9, verse 58: *svayaṁ rājñā na yoddhavyaṁ ye''pi śastrāstrakovidaḥ.*
[156] *Agni*, 236.63.
[157] *Ibid.*, chapts.228-32, 233.11, 236.1-24.
[158] *Ibid.*, 236.1-21.
[159] *Ibid.*, 236.62: *patākāśchaiva saṁbhāro vāditrāṇam bhayāvahaḥ.*
[160] *Ibid.*, 220.7, 220.8 and 220.10.
[161] *Ibid.*, chapt.222.

The description of the forts in the *Agni Purāṇa* conveys the idea of equating *durga* with a capital city, which should be constructed according to the principles of architecture. Our *Purāṇa* deals with the planning of town, especially of the capital.[166]

The *Agni Purāṇa* dwells at length upon the march of the army. It states that the king should undertake expedition when he finds himself and his allies (*akranda*) powerful and his rearward enemy in peril. According to it the strength of the ambitious monarch lies in that of soldiers, mercenaries and servants, and in his ability to keep his territory well-protected. The weaknesses of the adversaries are the results of divine wrath such as earthquake, discontent in the army, and internal revolt. The king is advised to utilise the weakness of his enemy and the high morale of his army to his own benefit.[167] The *Agni Purāṇa* also discusses the proper season of undertaking an invasion, varying according to the nature of the expeditionary force. The spring and the autumn seem to be the most favoured for a fourfold army. The reasons for choosing these two seasons are not offered by the *Agni Purāṇa*, but are attributed by the *Mahābhārata* and Kāmandaka to the climatic condition of India.[168] Rain and excessive heat make military movements very difficult. So the character of the forces and the topographical condition of the battlefield receive due consideration.

---

[162] *Ibid.*, 222.1-9 ; cf. *Matsya*, chapt.216. It is more elaborate. *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.553-9.

[163] *Ibid.*, 222.4 ; cf. *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.544-52, speaks of nine kinds of forts, and adds forts made of stones, bricks and clay.

[164] *Ibid.*, 222.5 ; *Arth.*, 2.3 ; *VDP*, II. 26.7 ; *Matsya*, 216.7 ; *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.552-3, considers the riverain fort along with the hill-fort as the best of nine types of forts, fort in a forest as the medium and human-fort and fort made of wood as the worst.

[165] *AWAI*, pp.138-41.

[166] *Agni*, chapt.106.

[167] *Agni*, 228.1-4 ; cf. *Arth.*, 9.1 and 3 ; *VDP*, II. 163.2-3 ; *Matsya*, 239.2-7 ; *KNS*, 15.1-3.

The prognostications of dreams, omens and portents are taken into account in starting an expedition. The *Agni Purāṇa* has one hundred and twenty verses on omens and portents, which are also discussed in some other early medieval texts.[169]

Our text states that the battle should be started when there are auspicious asteral signs. In seventeen and half chapters the *Agni Purāṇa* treats the science of astrology, which leads the king to victory.[170] The importance of astrology is further indicated by Utpala, who has a full treatise on this subject and by Someśvaradeva,[171] who asks the king to begin invasion under favourable asteral signs and on an auspicious day.[172] King Harṣa[173] and Chācha[174] are mentioned to have consulted a host of astrologers about the timing of military expeditions.

Actual war is to be preceded by the performance of a series of victory giving rituals for a week, according to the *Agni Purāṇa* and the *Viṣṇudharmottara.* They include worship of various gods and goddesses of his country, and regents of quarters, and propitiation of the presiding deities of rivers and various other gods on the route of expedition. The sacrificial rituals also include divination of future by the priest, worship of weapons and conveyances, and the ceremonial victory-bath (*vijayasnāna*).[175] The last ceremony is treated in detail in the *Liṅga Purāṇa*.[176] Propitiation of gods continues on the route of the march as well as after victory.[177] A similar, though less detailed, description of the propitiary rituals before expedition occurs in the *Harṣacharita*,[178] the *Dvyāśrayakāvya*[179] of Hemachandra, and in the *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi*.[180] Such practices continued under Kṛṣṇadevarāya of Vijayanagara and Śivājī.

---

[168] *Śānti.*, 100.11 ; *Udyoga.*, 142.16-17 ; *KNS*, 15.7.

[169] *Agni*, 228.7-8 and chapts.229-32 ; *VDP*, chapts.163-5 ; *Matsya*, chapts. 240-42 ; *Yukti.*, pp.176-7 ; *Nītimayūkha*, pp.91-95 ; *Rājanītiprakāśa*, pp. 333-9 ; *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.811-924 ; *Harṣacharita*: *eka Sāṁskṛtika Adhyayana*, Patna, 1953, p. 136.

[170] *Ibid.*, chapts. 123-39 (though it contains discussion of other aspect of general astrology also) and 233. 1-11 ; VDP, II. chapt.175.

[171] *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2. 745-924.

[172] *Ibid.*, I. 2.744. *śubhanakṣatra yoge cha śubhe vāre śubhe dine*, etc.

[173] *Harṣacharita*, canto. VII ; *History of India as told by its own Historians*, Vol. I. p. 140.

[174] *History of India as told by its own Historians*, Vol. I, p. 140. An unfavourable prediction by astrologers demoralised the army and the subjects of Lakṣamaṇasena to meet the threat of Muhammad Ibn Bakhtiyar ; *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, 7.766-9.

The *Agni Purāṇa* lays down that the *nāyaka* surrounded by picked heroes should be in the front; the king, the treasury, the harem and the weak soldiers in the middle ; and the horses, the chariots, the elephants the foresters on both sides followed by one after another. The commander-in-chief (*senāpati*) is supposed to be in the rear encouraging the weak and the worn-out troops.[181] This seems to be the general order of the marching army. However, in special circumstances the commander-in-chief is advised to form battle arrays befitting the situation. As for example, a crocodile-like array is to be formed in the event of a danger coming in the front; hawk type if the danger is in the flanks; bullock-cart shaped array if the army is attacked in the rear; and a circular array (*sarvatobhadra*) when the army is endangered on all sides.[182] The principle behind the construction of the battle arrays is to deploy the best and the largest number of troops to meet the danger in the first instance and secondly, not to provide any loop-hole to the enemy. The arrays are to be arranged in any shape resembling any limb of an animal, or a thing.[183] The *Agni Purāṇa* describes nine (actually ten) types of arrays such as *garuḍa*, *makara*, *chakra*, *śyena*, etc.[184] It also provides a fourfold classification of arrays based on Kāmandaka and sub-classifies them into a total of thirty types.[185] Accordingly the *daṇḍa* battle formations are mentioned to be of fourteen (actually seventeen types are described) kinds, the *bhoga* of five types, the *maṇḍala* of two types and the *asaṁhata* of six types. The *Nītipra-*

---

[175] *Agni*, 236.1-20 ; cf. *VDP*, chapt.176

[176] Quoted in the *Rājanītiprakāśa*, pp.351-75.

[177] *Agni*, 236.1-20.

[178] Canto VII.

[179] *Gūrjara Deśa.*, Vol.I, pp. 164-5.

[180] I. 2.1149-61.

[181] *Agni*, 243.4-6 ; *KNS*, 18.45-47.

[182] *Ibid.*, 242.7-8.

[183] *Ibid.*, 236.28.

[184] *Ibid.*, 236.29-30.

[185] *Ibid.*, 242.49-60 ; cf. *KNS*, 19.43-50.

kāśikā[186] gives us a nearly identical list of the arrays and adds that they may assume thousand of shapes.

Another classification of battle arrays, according to our text,[187] is based on the deployment of the fourfold army in a particular way; for example if the elephants are kept in the middle, chariots in the rear (*kakṣa*) and horse-troopers in the flanks (*pakṣa*), it is called a centre-piercing (*madhyabhedī*) array.

In its chapter on the science of archery (*dhanurveda*) the *Agni Purāṇa*[188] describes the various types of offensive weapons and the methods to use them. It does not mention any weapon which is not known from earlier sources, but it classifies weapons under five heads, weapons thrown by some machines (*yantramukta*), those thrown by hands (*pāṇimukta*), those which are thrown but held back (*muktasandhārita*), those which are never thrown (*amukta*), and natural weapons such as fist. A similar, but a little different, classification is provided by the *Nītiprakāśikā*.[189] It divides the weapons into four kinds: those which are thrown, those which are not thrown, those which are thrown as well as held back, and those which are sent through magical spells (*mantramukta*). According to the *Agni Purāṇa* *kṣepaṇī* and arrows are thrown by a machine; stones, *tomara* and machines are projected by hands; the *prāśa* is thrown and retained, and swords are never to be thrown. It provides us with two other classifications of weapons. According to the first, they may either belong to the group of weapons which are thrown (*śastra*) or which are manœuvred by keeping them in hands (*astra*). The second classification is based on their shapes, curved or straight.[190] Our text does not include the *pratyāstra* and the supernatural weapons (*paramāstra*) of the *Nītiprakāśikā*[191] in the chapter on military science, and so is more rational than the latter.

As regards the relative value of weapons, the *Agni Purāṇa* declares that battles fought with bow and arrow is the best, those fought with the barbed missile (*prāśa*) the second best, and those with swords the worst, and adds that wrestling needs no arms and so is only a semblance of fight.[192]

---

[186] 6.4-10: ... *vyūhāssahasraśo rājanniti jñeyā manīṣibhiḥ*; cf. *Agni*, 242-42: *koṭi cha vyūhaśastrajñeḥ* ...

[187] *Agni*, 242.42-48; *KNS*, 19.36-39.

[188] *Ibid.*, 249.2 220.8.

[189] *NP*, 2.11.

[190] *Agni*, 249.3.

[191] Cf. *NP*, 2.14.

The *Agni Purāṇa* gives much space to the manufacture of bows, arrows, strings, etc., and deals exhaustively with the ways and methods of training in archery.[193] It enumerates three kinds of bow.[194] The best one measures twelve fists (*muṣṭis*) or four cubits, the middle one measures three and a half cubits, and the last three cubits. In the opinion of the *Traiyambakadhanurveda* a bow measuring five and a half cubits is the best.[195] However, our text prefers a bow of three cubits and states that it is of general use. From the point of manœuvrability this view seems to be more practical. Our text knows bows made of metals, horn, wood, and of iron and horn mixed;[196] it also refers to strings made of bamboo, hemp, and the skin of the tree.[197] It seems that the bows of gold, silver, copper and iron, described by our text, are perhaps meant for decoration and ceremonial purposes. It states that a bow of bamboo, cut in autumn, is the best of all.[198] The elasticity, cheapness as well as availability of bamboo in India seems to weigh in its favour.

The *Agni Purāṇa* summarises the story of the mythical origin of the sword from the body of Lohadaitya,[199] as found in the *Śāntiparva*, the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Nītiprakāśikā*.[200] It also deals with the thirty-two types of movement of a sword. We find a different list of the thirty-two movements of sword in the *Nītiprakāśikā*.[201] The length, and good and bad signs of the sword are discussed by our text, and also by Bhoja followed by Mitramiśrā.[202] This shows growing knowledge about swords in early medieval times.

Our text next deals with the different movements of fourteen other weapons: *pāśa* (noose), *chakra* (wheel), *śūla* (trident), *gadā*, *paraśu* (axe), *mudgara* (club), *bhindipāla*, *laguḍa* (iron rod), *vajra*, *paṭṭiśa*, *kṛpāṇa* (dagger), *kṣepaṇi* and *yantra*, and also indicates the various ways and methods of wrestling.[203] It is not known how these weapons are manufactured. Some are described in the *Nītiprakāśikā*,[204] which mentions twelve types of *mukta* and twenty kinds of *amukta* weapons.

---

[192] *Agni*, 249.6-7.
[193] *Ibid.*, chapts.249-50.
[194] *Ibid.*, 249.35-37, 245.5-6.
[195] Quoted by the *Lakṣaṇaprakāśa*, p.277.
[196] *Agni*, 245.4, 245.7-8.
[197] *Ibid.*, 245.5.
[198] *Ibid.*, 245.10-11: *sarvaśreṣṭhaṁ dhanurbaṁśairgṛhītaiḥ śaradi śritaiḥ.*
[199] *Ibid.*, 245.14-27.
[200] *Śānti.*, chapt.166 ; *VDP*, II. chapt.17 ; *NP*, chapt.3.
[201] *Agni*, 252.4 ; cf. *VDP*, II, 182.1-4 ; *NP*. 3.25-28.
[202] *Yukti.*, pp.139-71 ; *Lakṣaṇaprakāśa*, pp.293-309.

Chapters on iconography and ancient traditions contained in our text give some information on weapons. We know of *śilā* (slings),[205] *nāgapāśa*,[206] *lāṅgala* (plough),[207] *kārmuka* (bow shaped weapon),[208] *mūśala*,[209] *aṅkuśa* (goad), [210] *śāraṅga*,[211] *paṭṭiśa*,[212] *daṇḍa* (rod),[213] *chhurikā* (knife),[214] *kuṭhāra* (axe),[215] *śalākā*,[216] *karttari*,[217] *khaṭvāṅga*,[218] *kaṭṭāri*,[219] *muṣṭi*,[220] *prāśa*[221] and *kunta*.[222]

The *Agni Purāṇa* speaks of certain weapons which may be termed as supernatural such as *aiṣikāstra*,[223] *jṛmbhāstra*,[224] *mānavāstra*,[225] *kalpaśastra*[226] (for cutting and piercing), *anukalāstra*[227] (for setting fire) and *kevalāstra*[228] (for reducing to ashes). We get another list of forty-five such arms.[229] Out of these fifty-one supernatural weapons fourteen are listed by the *Nītiprakāśikā* under the *muktāmukta* and one under *mantramukta* varieties of weapons.[230] All such weapons described by our *Purāṇa* may be conveniently classified under the *paramāstra* of the *Nītiprakāśikā*.[231]

---

[203] *Agni*, 252.5-27.
[204] *NP*. chapt.4-5.
[205] *Agni*, 10.7.
[206] *Ibid.*, 10.19, 50.2.
[207] *Ibid.*, 49.6-7, 12.23.
[208] *Ibid.*, 49.16.
[209] *Ibid.*, 49.20 and 21, etc.
[210] *Ibid.*, 49.20 and 21, etc.
[211] *Ibid.*, 49.20-22, etc.
[212] *Ibid.*, 49.21, 50.22.
[213] *Ibid.*, 49.23, 50.41.
[214] *Ibid.*, 49.23, 366.17.
[215] *Ibid.*, 50.2, 50.43, 366.17.
[216] *Ibid.*, 50.3,41, etc.
[217] *Ibid.*, 50.9.
[218] *Ibid.*, 50.30.
[219] *Ibid.*, 50.32, 133.14.
[220] *Ibid.*, 133.14.
[221] *Ibid.*, 135.5-7.
[222] *Ibid.*, 366.18.
[223] *Ibid.*, 14.22.
[224] *Ibid.*, 12.50.
[225] *Ibid.*, 5.8.
[226] *Ibid.*, 84.56.
[227] *Ibid.*, 84.59.
[228] *Ibid.*, 84.59.
[229] *Ibid.*, chapts 321-4.
[230] *NP*, 2.22-38.

As for the defensive weapons the *Agni Purāṇa* speaks of coats of mails (*varma*) and shield (*charma*), and states that they are used by the swordsmen.[232] It further speaks of iron coats of mails,[233] which were in general use in the early medieval period.

The *Agni Purāṇa* also enunciates some important principles of strategy and methods of war. First, it lays down that in any case the king should not engage himself in actual fighting.[234] It does not accept the view of Kāmandaka,[235] who permits the king in emergency to fight though with a huge force. This view is in line with the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Yuktikalpataru*. The *Agni Purāṇa* states that the commander is the life of the battle. His death means destruction of the army.[236]

Second, it instructs that a large force fighting against a small one should be arrayed in extended lines, and in the reverse case it should fight in long narrow column concentrating its strength at one point.[237] Third, it lays down that ample space should be provided between two soldiers for free movement of weapons by them. They should be arranged neither too close nor too apart.[238] The *Agni Purāṇa* adds that there should be a gap of five bows between two types of soldiers.[239] Thus the soldiers are expected not to act like a crowd but to fight in a disciplined manner. Fourth, the king is advised to annihilate the best section of his enemy's force with full might, and if he is himself attacked, to meet his adversary with a solid mass of his best soldiers, who are to be placed in the van.[240] Fifth, a general retreat should be ordered by the king in the face of a debacle of his main line.[241] Sixth, the *Agni Purāṇa* provides substitutes for different units of the army.[242]

---

[231] *Ibid.*, 2.14.

[232] *Agni*, 252.4.

[233] *Ibid.*, 251.9-10 ; *VDP*, II. 181.12-13.

[234] *Ibid.*, 236.33, 242.33.

[235] Cf. *KNS*, 19.15.

[236] *Agni*, 242.45 ; *KNS*, 19.35.

[237] *Ibid.*, 236.27-28.

[238] *Ibid.*, 236.35: *na saṁhatānna viralānyodhānvyūhe prakalpayet, āyudhānāṁ tu saṁmardo yathā na svātparasparaṁ.* ; 242.35-36 ; *KNS*, 19.25.

[239] *Ibid.*, 242.40 ; cf. *KNS*, 19.29. The tern *pañchadhā* in our own text should read *pañchachāpa* as in the *KNS*.

[240] *Ibid.*, 236.36.

[241] *Ibid.*, 236.34.

[242] *Ibid.*, 242.47-48.

Seventh, it states that in a battle army consists of five parts, and the king should engage only one or two parts of it in actual fighting, while the rest should be kept in reserve to safeguard the vanguard.[243] The weaker section is placed in the rear of the army. The *Agni Purāṇa* opines that the king should gather even large numbers of weak and fearful persons in the army to terrorise the enemy.[244] But a large number of untrained persons in the battlefield may, in our opinion, cause confusion in the fighting rank. Eighth, the usual religious and emotional excitement is to be provided to the soldiers. Our *Purāṇa* enjoins the king to remind the soldiers of their names and their glorious family traditions. It further repeats the old *smṛti* tradition, according to which death in the battlefield is the best of all the sacrifices and a retreat from it is as sinful as killing a brāhmaṇa. The king is also advised to provide monetary and material rewards liberally to the soldiers for exemplary bravery shown in the battle.[244a] Our text adds that a little gift cannot induce the heroes. However, a detailed rate of prizes given to the soldiers, as we find in the *Arthaśāstra*, the *Kāmandaka Nītisāra* and the *Nītiprakāśikā* is lacking.[244b] It is interesting that our *Purāṇa*, relying on high moral principles expounded in the *smṛtis*, does not prescribe the use of wine to boost the morale and fighting capacity of soldiers as is done by the *Nītiprakāśikā* and even widely practised in modern times.[245]

The *Agni Purāṇa* recommends righteous battle (*dharmayuddha*) to the king.[246] However, it does not discard the idea of a deceitful battle. According to it, a weaker power, if forced to war, may resort to treacherous methods in the battle.[247] It lays down that a treacherous battle should be waged to destroy the enemy by killing the tired and sleepish in a forest or on the banks of a river, or by killing those who are facing bad days.[248] The *Purāṇa* discusses the various tactics

---

243 *Agni*, 236.31-32: *ekena yadi vā dvābhyāṁ yuddhamācharet, bhāgatrayaṁ sthāpayettu teṣāṁ rakṣārthameva cha.*

244 *Ibid.*, 236.40-42; *VDP*, II. 177.36-38.

244a *Ibid.*, 236.51-56, 242.34-35; cf. *KNS*, 19.17-20; *VDP*, II.177.51-63.

244b *Arth.*, 10.3; *NP*, 6.88-101; *KNS*, 19.18-20; *Abhilaṣi*, I.2.1162-67.

245 *NP*, 6.51 and comments thereon: *vividhāni cha vādyāni tathā kairātakaṁ madhu* . . . Sitārāma, the commentator, explains the term *kairātakaṁ* as a kind of wine used to boost the courage in war (*yuddhotsāhajanakaṁ madyaṁ*).

246 *Agni*, 233.26: *jigīṣurdharmavijayī tathā lokaṁ vaśaṁ nayet.*

247 *Ibid.*, 242.13.

248 *Ibid.*, 236.58-62.

of a treacherous war, in which one can deceive the enemies and kill the tired, slow, defeated, fatigued, sleeping, exhausted soldiers of enemies by letting loose elephants or swordsmen at night.[249] It also proposes the use of stupifying incense, dreadful music, strange flags, poison, spells and charms, black magic, etc. Our text leans more towards the *arthaśāstra* view than the *smṛti* tradition.[250] On the other hand the *Viṣṇudharmottara* prescribes treacherous battle only to punish the sinful, and totally prohibits the murder of those soldiers who are fatigued, sleeping, half rising and have fallen on bad days (*durdina*).

The *Agni Purāṇa* expounds certain ethical principles for the king and his soldiers to be observed in war. It ordains that in a foreign land the king should follow the customs of that country. It advises the king to worship the deities of that country and not to interfere with and destroy the sources of income of the temples. It adds that the inhabitants of enemy's country should not be treated contemptuously.[251] Besides these general principles to be observed in a foreign land, our text prescribes a code of conduct to be followed by the army. It wants soldiers to fight with equals such as an elephant with an elephant,[252] and adds that three foot-soldiers may be taken as equal to a horse-trooper, three (five?) horsemen or fifteen foot-soldiers as equal to an elephant, and infantry soldiers comparable to nine elephants are equal to a chariot.[253] The soldiers are also asked not to kill one who is flying in terror, an onlooker, a passer-by (*praviṣṭāścha*), one who is without arms, one who is fallen, and such others.[254] Some rules are to be followed in the case of those who are defeated. Our *Purāṇa* lays down that after gaining victory the victorious monarch should worship the gods and the brāhmaṇas of the defeated country.[255] He is advised against appropriating the wife of the king and other women of that country; on the contrary they are to be protected. It points out that the enemies captured in the battlefield should be set free and looked after like sons, and in no case they should be fought with. Furthermore, it advocates that due respect should be shown to the laws and customs of the conquered country.[256] Thus the code of conduct prescribed by our text for the king and his warriors lays a great emphasis on due respect for the susceptibilities of the people, especially their religious practices. Some rules are intended to win the affection of the defeated people.

---

[249] *Ibid.*, 242.13-23 ; cf. *KNS*, 18.54-69.

[250] *Ibid.*, 236.58-59: *ś(r)ānte nidrābhibhūte cha ardhottīrṇe nadīvane, durdine kūṭayuddhāni śatrunāśārthamācharet ;* cf. *VDP*, II. 177.77-78 : ... *śrāntena vābhibhūtena ardhottīrṇabalenacha, durdine na cha yuddhāni kartavyāni mahābala.*

[251] *Ibid.*, 236.22-23 ; cf. *VDP*, II. 177.72-74.

[252] *Ibid.*, 236.57: *dharmaniṣṭhe jayo rājñi yoddhabyāścha samāḥ samaiḥ* . . ; cf. *VDP*, II. 177.72-74.

[253] *Ibid.*, 242.37-39.

[254] *Ibid.*, 236.57-58 ; cf. *VDP*, II. 177.74-76.

[255] *Ibid.*, 236.62.

As regards the distribution of the spoils of war, the *Agni Purāṇa*[257] reserves gems and precious stones for the king, and states that he should distribute them equally among his subordinates. As compared with this, the list of things reserved for the king in the *Viṣṇudharmottara*[258] is somewhat longer, and includes shields, conveyances, and weapons captured in the war. The *Nītiprakāśikā*,[259] on the other hand, limits the king's share to only a half of the captured riches and one-fourth of horses and other conveyances. It seems from our text that with the growth in power of high officers, feudal lords, as well as the growing importance of mercenary soldiers, the king's share of the spoils of war came to be restricted to gems and precious stones.

Inter-state relations:

The *Agni Purāṇa* favours the idea of an expanding state (*jigīṣu*) which follows the policy of self-aggrandisement.[260] It lays down that the king should set out to conquer his enemies immediately after his coronation.[261] This he can achieve with the help of his allies, who are one of the constituents of the state. The principle to subdue enemies with the help of friends is developed by our *Purāṇa* into the traditional theory of the circle of twelve states.[262]

According to our *Purāṇa* there are two circles of states, circle of states under the influence of the expanding state and the circle of inimical states. Enemies are divided into three categories, ancestral (*kulya*), immediate neighbour (*anantara*), and acquired (*kṛtrima*), and each one of them is comparatively more dangerous than the succeeding one.[263]

---

[256] *Ibid.*, 236.63-64.

[257] *Ibid.*, 236.63 and 66 ; cf. *KNS*, 19.21.

[258] II. 177.85. *ratnāni rājagāmini charmavāhanamāyudham.*

[259] 6.103-4.

[260] *Agni*, 233.26.

[261] *Ibid.*, 220.1.

[262] *Ibid.*, 233.13.

[263] *Ibid.*, 225.9, 233.21 ; *VDP*, II. 65.18, II. 175.15.

At one place, the *Agni Purāṇa* states that the contiguous rival is really an acquired enemy.[264] This view is in conformity with Kāmandaka and Somadeva Sūri, who mention only two types of enemies, ancestral (*sahaja*) and artificial or acquired (*kāryaja* or *kṛtrima*). Similarly friends are classified into three groups, ancestral or traditional, feudatories of enemies, and acquired (*kṛtrima*).[265] Our *Purāṇa* also provides a slightly different list of four types of friends based on Kāmandaka,[266] and catalogues their good qualities. This categorisation of friends and foes by our text and other works on polity points to three important principles of inter-state relationship. First, ties of blood relationship are valued much. Secondly, immediate neighbouring states are considered to be always hostile to one another. Thirdly, we find that the feudatory states are generally treated as inimical to their overlords. All these hypotheses lead us to think of a state of affairs in which states being obsessed with the idea of self-aggrandisement are in perpetual hostility to one another, and the states reduced to the position of vassals desire to regain their freedom with the connivance of kings opposed to their overlords.

The description of the circle of twelve states indicates a state of constant antagonism between various kingdoms. The ambitious state is surrounded by its enemy in the front followed by its ally, enemy of its ally, friend of its friend, and enemy of its friend's friend. The rear is occupied by the rearward enemy (*pārṣṇigrāha*), rearward friend (*ākranda*), friend of the rearward enemy (*asāra*), and the friend of the rearward friend (*ākrandāsāra*). The other two members of this circle of twelve states are *madhyastha* or *madhyama* and the *udāsīna*. The intermediate (*madhyastha*) state is described as one which is near to both the ambitious state and its enemy and capable of resisting and helping both of them.[267] Thus it acts as a strong buffer state. The neutral state (*udāsīna*) is defined by our text as a very powerful kingdom situated outside the circle of states and capable of helping all of them combined and of destroying them separately. The *Agni Purāṇa* together with the *Viṣṇudharmottara* enjoins the ambitious king to widen his circle of friends and declares that no one is a natural foe or friend to the other but some causes make them so.[268] It adds if a friend of the ambitious ruler is subjugated as a vassal by the latter's enemy he turns out to be a foe.[269] The same view is held by Somadeva Sūri,[270] who discards the idea that the immediate neighbour is always an enemy and the king whose kingdom is beyond the contiguous neighbour is ever a friend. Thus our text follows the traditional conception of the circle of states, but finds it difficult to always accept the basic principle underlying it. It appears that the traditional theory of the circle of states was becoming ineffective and gradually losing its popularity. Somadeva[271] discusses this theory and describes only nine states: neutral state, intermediate state, ambitious state, enemy of ambitious state, rearward enemy, rearward friend, rearward enemy's friend, rearward friend's friend, and hilly tracts between the ambitious state and its enemy. According to the commentary to the *Nītivākyāmṛta*,[272] which belongs to A.D. 1484, the circle of states consists of only seven types of states, including the intermediate hilly kingdom. The commentator excludes the neutral and the intermediate states. The contemporary *Nītiprakāśikā*[273] does not refer to the circle of twelve states. Its one word *pārṣṇimūla* cannot be regarded as covering this, as has been done by its commentator. The *Bārhaspatyasūtra* speaks of only three

---

[264] *Ibid.*, 233.22: *anantaro'pi yaḥ śatruḥ so'pi me kṛtrimo mataḥ*; VDP, II. 175.16 contains the same view.

[265] *KNS*, 8.56; *NVA*, 29.33-34.

[266] *Agni.*, 239.36-37; cf. *KNS*, 4.74. We find a correct reading of this verse in *KNS*, (TSS. 4.71), where it is *maitrasambaddhaṁ* instead of *kṛtasambaddhaṁ* in the Bombay edition and *tatra sannadhaṁ* in our text.

[267] *Ibid.*, 233.14-20, chapt.240; cf. *Arth.*, 6.2. and Book 7; *Manu* 7.154-211; *Yāj.*, 1.345-8; *KNS*, chapts 8-11; *VDP*. II. chapts. 145-50; *NVA*, 29.20-29. It refers to a new type of state i.e. *antardhi* consisting of hilly tribes and foresters lying between the ambitious state and its enemy, and getting emoluments from both. Such a state is not referred to in any other text.; *Rājanītiprakāśa*, pp.316-30; *Nītimayūkha*, pp.44-46, etc. The circle of

---

states will be clear from the following diagram taken from Kane's *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol.III, p.222n:—

	Neutral.								
Enemy of friend's friend.	Friend's friend.	Friend's enemy.	Ally	Enemy	Ambitious ruler.	Rearward enemy	Rearward friend	Friend of rearward enemy	Rearward friend's friend
				Intermediate state					

268 *Ibid.*, 233.20: *na kasyachidripurmitraṁ kārṇāchchhatrumitrake.*

269 *Agni*, 233.24.

270 *NVA*, 29.35.

271 *Ibid.*, 29.20.

272 *Ibid.*, comments on *NVA*, 29.29: *evaṁ saptavidharājamaṇḍalamantardhisohitaṁ bhūbhujā vijñeyaṁ.*

273 *NP*, 1.53. and comments thereon.

types of state: hostile, friendly, and neutral, and has nothing to say on the *maṇḍala* theory. Chaṇḍeśvara[274] discusses this theory summarily and does not allude to the twelve types of states. Even Someśvaradeva, who is an original and thorough writer on polity, does not refer to this theory. Thus we find a growing lack of interest in the theory of the circle of twelve states in our period.

Our *Purāṇa*[275] next states the traditional sixfold policy or sixfold stages of diplomacy: peace (*sandhi*), hostility (*vigraha*), neutrality (*āsana*), expedition (*yāna*), duplicity (*dvaidhībhāva*) and seeking shelter (*saṁśraya*). These terms are defined in the traditional way, but there are two important differences. First, the neutrality of the *Agni Purāṇa* is not a policy of indifference advocated by Kauṭilya and Somadeva Sūri[276] but is armed neutrality, i. e. mobilisation within the kingdom. Secondly, the duplicity (*dvaidhībhāva*) is explained by Kauṭilya, Kāmandaka, Somadeva Sūri and Mitramiśra as making peace with one state and following a hostile policy towards the other.[277] Someśvaradeva[278] discusses the five kinds of duplicity mostly of profession and action to cheat the enemy. However, according to the *Agni* and the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*[279], duplicity means undertaking expeditions with only half the army. The same explanation is given by the *Rājanītiprakāśa*,[280] the *Rājanītiratnākara*,[281] the *Mitākṣarā*[282] and Kullūka Bhaṭṭa.[283] Further, our text gives a more clear difinition of *saṁśraya*, which means seeking help of the more powerful intermediate or the neutral state.[284]

The *Agni Purāṇa*[285] provides an alternative definition of the six kinds of diplomacy and enumerates their different categories, the whole thing being based on Kāmandaka. The compiler fails to reconcile these two lists given in the *Agni Purāṇa.* In the list based on Kāmandaka we find sixteen types of treaty, five kinds of hostility, expedition and neutrality, and treatment of duplicity and taking shelter of the powerful. Obviously the exposition of the sixfold policy is far more detailed in the *Agni Purāṇa* than in the *Manu Smṛti* and the *Nītiprakāśikā*,[286] for these two texts describe only two types of peace, war, expedition, neutrality, duplicity and seeking shelter of the powerful. Similarly the *Nītivākyāmṛta* and other *Purāṇas* do not indicate the various types of sixfold diplomacy. Someśvaradeva[287] mentions four types of treaty, eight types of hostility, ten kinds of neutrality, three kinds of shelter and five varieties of duplicity, and thus shows some originality. Compared with this our text is more detailed but not original.

---

[274] *RR*, p.59.

[275] 234.16-20 ; cf. *VDP*, II. 150.2-5.

[276] *Arth.*, 7.1: *upekṣaṇamāsanaṁ*; *KNS*, II.23 ; same in *NVA*, 29.46 ; cf. *Agni*, 234.19 : *vigraheṇa svake deśe sthitirāsanamuchyate*; and *VDP*, II. 150.4.

[277] *Arth.*, 7.1 ; *KNS*, 11.24 ; *NVA*, 29.48 ; comments on *Yāj.*, 1.347.

[278] *Abhiiaṣi.*, II. 1.955-60.

[279] *Agni*, 234.19 ; *VDP*, II. 150.4.

[280] p.325: *dvaidhībhāvaḥ svabalasyadvidhākaraṇam.*

[281] p.56.

[282] On *Yāj.*, 1.347.

[283] On *Manu*, 7.160 and adds self-interest (*svārthasiddhasye*) as the purpose behind this policy.

[284] *Agni*, 234.20 ; cf. *Arth.*, 7.1: *parārpaṇaṁ saṁśrayaḥ* and *Mitākṣarā* on *Yāj.*. 1.347: *saṁśrayo balavadāśrayaṇam*, etc.

[285] Chapt.240.

The *Agni Purāṇa*[288] states that, of the six types of diplomacy, peace and war are most important. It thus follows Vātavyādhi, as referred to by Kauṭilya,[289] and makes an important departure from the views held by Kauṭilya, Kāmandaka and the *Viṣṇudharmottara*.[290]

Peace being one of the two important methods of diplomacy, it occupies considerable space in our *Purāṇa*. Like Kauṭilya, Kāmandaka and other writers on polity, it defines peace as an agreement with pledge.[291] It desires the king to enter into treaty with either his equals or with those superior in strength. He is further advised to wage war against a weak state or conquer it.[292] Treaties are advocated either to escape the invasion of the powerful or to deceive his equals. So the interest of the state underlies all overtures for peace.

The *Agni Purāṇa* enumerates sixteen types of treaties but does not define them, as is done by Kāmandaka.[293] The sixteen varieties of treaties are :

(i) treaty with equal (*kapāla*),
(ii) treaty negotiated with gifts (*upahāra*),
(iii) matrimonial alliance (*santāna*),
(iv) treaty of friendship (*saṅgata*),

---

[286] *Manu*, 7.160-8 and *NP*, 8.80-85.
[287] *Abhilaṣi.*, II. 1.724-966.
[288] 234.16.
[289] *Arth.*, 7.1.
[290] *VDP*, II. 150.1-2.
[291] *Agni*, 234.18.
[292] *Supra.*
[293] *Ibid.*, 240.6-8 ; *KNS*, 9.2-19.

(v) treaty to achieve something good (*upanyāsa*),
(vi) treaty for mutual help (*pratikāra*),
(vii) treaty for joint venture to achieve some aim (*saṁyoga*),
(viii) treaty to gain something through their chiefs of the armies (*puruṣāntara*),
(ix) treaty with one who makes agreement with enemies (*adṛṣṭanara*),
(x) treaty after offering land (*ādiṣṭa*),
(xi) compact with his own army (*ātmā*),
(xii) purchasing safety of life at all cost (*upagraha*),
(xiii) treaty after offering money to protect his kingdom (*parikrama*),
(xiv) treaty at the cost of fertile land (*chhina*),
(xv) treaty after offering all the land produce (*paradūṣaṇa* or *paribhūṣaṇa*), and finally,
(xvi) treaty after offering some fruits to be placed on shoulders of servants (*skandhopaneya*).

But treaty for mutual help, treaty of friendship, matrimonial alliance, and one negotiated with some gifts are described as the four most important agreements.[294]

The *Agni Purāṇa* forbids treaty with twenty kinds of persons such as a minor, an old man, an invalid, one who is excommunicated by his kith and kin, a coward, greedy or terrified person, and one who is either excessively fond of earthly possessions or has renounced all worldly ties. Similarly, the king is not allowed to negotiate a treaty with one who speaks ill of a god and the brāhmaṇas, with a man of diversified interests, and with a country which has been visited by famine, pestilence or has a discontented army, etc. Like Kauṭilya and Kāmandaka, our *Purāṇa* ordains that these types of men must be fought and conquered.[295] It opposes indiscriminate agreements and recommends war against the above-mentioned types of rulers, perhaps because it is easier to conquer and annex their kingdoms.

The *Agni Purāṇa* thus deals with the definition, purpose and the classification of treaties, and also mentions persons with whom treaties should not be made. But no light is thrown either on the guarantee of such treaties and the method of breaking them, as is done by Kauṭilya. Our text seems to look upon high morality and faith in god on the part

[294] *Ibid.*, 240.6-9.
[295] *Ibid.*, 240.10-14 ; cf. *KNS*, 9.23-27.

of the contracting parties as the guarantee of agreements. Countries loose such faith due to famine, epidemics and the presence of unbelievers, and so are declared to be unfit for the negotiation of an alliance. Furthermore, in order to implement the terms of alliance effectively it excludes minors, old and infirm persons from negotiations.

An important aspect of the inter-state relations in ancient India is devising proper ways and means termed *upāya*. The *Agni Purāṇa* dilates on these expedients at three different places and refers to seven ways of dealing with another state.[296] They are conciliation, gift, dissension, punishment, indifference and causing illusion either with or without magical tricks. The earlier *dharmaśāstra* and epic literature[297] knows of only four ways. Later the number of expedients is increased to five[298] and more generally to seven. Our *Purāṇa*, like Kāmandaka and some late *Purāṇas*,[299] adds indifference (*upekṣā*), illusion (*māyā*) and magical tricks (*indrajāla*) to the traditional list of four ways of diplomacy.

The *Agni Purāṇa*[300] provides two lists of conciliation. The first deals with the nature of conciliation and the area of its application. According to it conciliation is either sincere (*tathya*) applicable to enemies of noble and spiritual temperament, or false (*atathya*) followed in case of those who are rough and misbehave like a demon. According to the second list conciliations are of four kinds: enumeration of the help given to each other, recollection of old relationship existing between them, use of sweet words and a complete surrender with these words that 'I am yours and at your disposal';[301] this list also contains the methods to negotiate conciliations. To this Kāmandaka[302] and the *Nītiprakāśikā*[303] add a fifth one. So two types of conciliations are mentioned, one based on some immediate mutual benefit and the other on reciprocal understanding. Someśvaradeva[304] adds that conciliation can be based on divine oath (*daivika*) and also on greed (*lobhaja*).[305]

---

[296] *Ibid.*, 226.5-6, 241.46.

[297] *Manu*, 7.109 ; *Yāj.*, 1.346 ; *Rāmāyaṇa* V. 41.2-3 ; *Śānti.*, 69.23 ; *NP*, 8.73. Though the *NP* (1.49) refers to seven expedients but later on discusses only the four traditional methods of diplomacy.

[298] *Udyoga.*, 132.29-30 adds *naya* to the traditional list of four.

[299] Cf. *KNS*, 17.3 ; *Sabhā.*, 5.21 ; *VDP*, II. 66.2-3, here the word *Rāma* should be replaced by *dāna* otherwise the list of seven expedients remains incomplete. *Matsya*, 222.2 ; *Bāhaspatyasūtra*, 5.1-3. It refers to the existence of seven methods of diplomacy but actually mentions six, leaving out magical tricks ; *daṇḍa* is replaced by *vadha*.

[300] *Agni*, 226.6-8 ; *VDP*, II. 67.2 ; *Matsya*, 221.2.

[301] *Ibid.*, 241.47-48.

[302] *KNS*, 17.4-5.

[303] *NP*, 8.74-75.

Our text lays down that the king should sow dissension among those of his enemies who are inimical to, angry with, insulted by, and afraid of one another. Discord among them can be created either through raising high hopes, or offering bribes to those who are attached to the enemy, or through threats. It also recommends the appointment of secret spies for this job and enjoins the king to afford best protection to them.[306] The discord among enemies assumes three shapes, estrangement of good relationship, quarrel, and letting out each other's secret.[307]

Our text makes one important change in the three types of discord mentioned by Kāmandaka and the *Nītiprakāśikā*. While the other texts recommend use of threats, the *Agni Purāṇa* enjoins divulging of secrets.[308] Our *Purāṇa* advises the king not only to create discord among his enemies but also to be aware of such dissensions among his own relatives, officers and feudatories.[309] The same idea is repeated in the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, the *Matsya* and the *Brahma Purāṇa* as quoted by Lakṣmīdhara.[310] The *Matsya Purāṇa* declares that the king can be victorious over his enemies, but internal dissension (*antaḥ kopa*) destroys even a powerful king like Indra.[311]

The *Agni Purāṇa* instructs the king to send out spies to know the inner feelings of the people, and the weaknesses and loopholes of the treasury, allies and the army of his enemy.[312] Furthermore, it mentions fourteen types of peoples of the enemy's kingdom who, in its opinion, should be won over primarily through offering honour and bribe.[313] The king should win the affection of the disaffected through conciliatory measures, and of the allies of the enemies through severe threatenings.[314] The fourteen kinds of persons amenable to division include those who are duped with false hopes, are greedy, have been insulted after being

---

304 *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.976-82.

305 The second list given by the *Agni Purāṇa* finds favour also with the *Rājanītiprakāśa*, which quotes its verses (p. 280).

306 *Agni*, 226.9-10.

307 *Ibid.*, 241.50-51.

308 *Ibid.*, 241.51 ; cf. *KNS*, 17.8 ; *NP*, 8.78.

309 *Ibid.*, 226.11.

310 *VDP*, II. 68.8 ; *Matsya*, chapt.223 ; *Rājadharmakāṇḍa*, p.128.

311 *Matsya*, 223.11.

312 *Agni*, 241.10.

313 *Ibid.*, 241.59. *pradhānadānamānaṁ cha bhedopāyāḥ prakīrtitā.*

314 *Ibid.*, 241.58.

called, those who are enemies of the king, those who have been superseded in rank, those who are proud, those whose religious feelings have been hurt, and those whose wife or property has been forcibly taken away, etc. The king is required to pacify and honour such persons coming from the enemy's land.[315] Bereft of all his allies, the enemy becomes powerless and is destroyed easily like a wormeaten log of wood.[316] Thus the means to create division in the rank of the enemy seems to be complicated but important.

Though bribery is employed to create dissension and seems to be part of it,[317] its importance seems to be great because it is mentioned as an independent method of diplomacy. Our text declares it to be the best of all the seven methods, as in its opinion money allures all, besides being useful for this world and the next after death.[318] The bribery or the gift assumes five shapes, viz. to return what has been received (*pratidāna*), to agree to forcible seizure by a person (*gṛhitasyānumodana*), to make monetary presents as never offered before (*dravyadānamapurvaṁ*), to transfer to the other what has been captured by one (*svayaṁ grāhapravarttana*), and to grant remission in taxes (*devaścha pratimokṣaścha*).[319] The number of the kinds of bribery seems to grow from five in the *Arthaśāstra*,[320] Kāmandaka,[321] and the *Nītiprakāśikā*[322] to sixteen in the *Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi* of Someśvaradeva.[323] On the other hand *smṛtis*, the compiler of other *Purāṇas*, Somadeva Sūri and some digest writers[324] do not mention them at all perhaps because they dislike such lowly practices. A comparison of our *Purāṇa's* view on this question with that of the other texts is instructive. First, our *Purāṇa* completely endorses Kāmandaka. Secondly, though the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Nītiprakāśikā* specify five kinds of bribery, their lists are somewhat different from our text.[325] Thirdly, the *Rājanītiprakāśa* quotes verses from our text but makes one slight change.[326] Fourthly, we find that Someśvaradeva's list is the most exhaustive and clear. He includes allurements of district, village, tributes, elephants, horses, permanent gifts, dress, gems, honour of offering seat, umbrella, *chowrie*, conveyance, mines, money, daughter, harlots, customs duties, etc.[327] Finally, though our *Purāṇa* and the *Matsya Purāṇa* attach much importance to the methods of conciliation and bribery, they do not exalt them to the position of the constituents of the state, as is done by the *Visṇudharmottara.*[328]

---

[315] *Ibid.*, 241.55-58.

[316] *Ibid.*, 241.59.

[317] *Supra.*

[318] *Ibid.*, 226.12 ; cf. *VDP*, II. 69.1 ; *Matsya*, 223.1-8.

[319] *Ibid.*, 241.49-50 ; *KNS*, 17.6-7.

[320] *Arth.*, 9.6.

[321] *KNS*, 17.6-7.

[322] *NP*, 8.76-77.

[323] *Abhilaṣi.*, II. 1.1002-28.

[324] *Manu*, *Yāj.*, *VDP*, *Matsya*, *NVA*, Lakṣmīdhara, Chaṇḍeśvara and others.

[325] The list of the *Arthaśāstra* includes abandonment of what is to be paid, continuance of what is being paid, repayment of what is received, payment of one's own wealth, and help for a voluntary raid on the property of others (Eng. Tr., p.382). The *Nītiprakāśikā* mentions surrender

Punishment (*daṇḍa*) is the last of the four traditional methods of diplomacy. Our *Purāṇa* along with other late *Purāṇas* and the *Nītisāra*[329] enjoins the king to employ this method of state policy only when the enemy is not controlled by three earlier ways. This principle is first laid down by Manu,[330] who advises its adoption as a last resort. The same view is repeated by the *Mahābhārata*[331] and the *Bṛhatparāśara Smṛti*. The first furnishes a practical example of the gradual use of the fourfold diplomacy, and the second draws our attention to the conditions which render the use of punishment necessary. The *Bṛhatparāśara*[332] states that as the result of punishment is dubious and war destroys one's strength, the king should first employ conciliation, dissension and bribery. In the *Mahābhārata*[333] Kṛṣṇa in dealing with Kauravas first uses conciliation, then dissension and finally the policy of gift. When these three methods do not succeed he recommends punishment (*daṇḍa*). The view of our *Purāṇa* is also supported by Someśvaradeva,[334] who declares the policy of conciliation as the best, dissension as the middle, bribery as the worst, and the policy of punishment as most hazardous (*kaṣṭatama*) because the outcome of war is

---

of one's own wealth, help to get the property of others, offer of strange or new things, invitation to capture enemy's property, and paying off his debts (*ṛṇamochana*).

[326] *Rājanītiprakāśa*, p.282: *dravyadānamapūrvaṁ cha tathaiveṣṭapravartanam;* cf. *Agni*, 241.49: *dravya... svayaṁgrāhapravartanam.*

[327] *Abhilaṣi.*, II. 1009-24. According to it various types of allurements are *abhiṣṭa, hāvana, deśya, karaja, danti, saptija, grāmaja, śāsana, bhṛṣā, vasana, pratipattija, ākara, rukmaja, kanyā, veśyā* and *velākara.*

[328] II. 145.3: *sāma dānaṁ tathā durgaṁ kośo daṇḍastathaiva cha, mitraṁ janapadaśchaiva rājyaṁ saptāṅgamuchyate.*

[329] *Agni*, 226.13; *Matsya*, 224.1.; *KNS*, 18.1.

[330] *Manu*, 7.108.

[331] *Śānti.*, 69.23.

[332] Calcutta edition, 12.40-41.

[333] *Udyoga*, chapt.150 (cr.ed. 148).

[334] *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.969-73.

always full of risks. Even Manu,[335] who believes more in high moral principles and a clear game than in the intricacies involved in the statecraft, eulogises the expedients of conciliation and punishment and recommends their use for the growing prosperity of the state. Thus the views of our *Purāṇa* are more practical and in keeping with the *arthaśāstra* tradition.

Late *Purāṇas*,[336] including our own, put punishments under two categories; as applied in one's own kingdom and as applied to the enemies. The latter type of *daṇḍa* is again subdivided into two groups, open and secret. The act of plunder in the enemy's land, destruction of the villages and the crops or setting fire to them comes under the open punishment, while the use of poison, setting fire (in secret), secret murders through spies, poisoning fuel and water, and the use of incantations form the secret punishment.[337]

Our text, like the *Nītiprakāśikā*, divides punishments into three kinds, murder, seizure of property (*arthaharaṇa*) and corporal punishment, according to the methods employed by the king.[338] A more detailed list of the methods of punishment is provided by Someśvaradeva, who states that these three modes of punishments apply only to a weak enemy. He recommends another twelve methods for punishing a powerful enemy. They include the destruction of the forests, ponds, setting fire to villages, cutting away the nose and ears of the people (*janāṅgachhedana*), seizure of the cattle (*gograha*) and the harvest (*dhānyaharaṇa*), imprisonment of the relatives, householders and the rich persons (*bandigrāha*), annexation of the territory (*deśahāraka*), plunder of gold, etc., by soldiers (*sarvasvaharaṇa*), destruction of forts (*durgabhaṅga*), setting fire to the palace, residential buildings, markets, stables, etc. (*sthānadāha*), driving away the enemies to hills and forests (*deśanirvāsaka*) and finally killing them in the battle.[339]

Three new expedients of statecraft, indifference (*upekṣā*) and illusions (*māyā* and *indrajāla*) with incantations or without them are first enumerated by Kāmandaka and adopted later by other texts including our own *Purāṇa*. The situations when a king should employ the policy of indifference towards his enemy are discussed by our text. It lays down that a king should be indifferent to his foe when he thinks that he is neither in agreement with nor at war with his enemy. This policy is to be followed also when the king thinks that a treaty will entail a great danger, conciliation will bring shame, bribery will nean monetary loss, and when he finds that it will not be possible to create dissension among his enemies or punish them. Our *Purāṇa* adds that the king should be indifferent to his enemy when he finds himself or his enemy unable to do any harm to each other.[340]

---

[335] *Manu*, 7.109: *sāmadaṇḍau praśansanti nityaṁ rāṣṭrābhivṛddhaye.*

[336] *Agni*, 234.1; *VDP*, II. 146.1.

[337] *Ibid.*, 234.1-3, 241.52-53 ; cf. *VDP*, II. 146.1-5. The copyist of our text makes a blunder when in 234.3 he leaves out '*a*' before '*prakāśo'tha*' which makes the meaning totally wrong. The *VDP's* reading is better than the *Agni Purāṇa's*, which uses *sādhūnām* in place of *yavasādinām* of the *VDP*.

[338] *Ibid.*, 241.51. The *NP* (8.79) uses *dehasaṁśikṣanaṁ* in place of *vadha* in the *Agni Purāṇa*.

[339] *Abhilaṣi.*, I. 2.1030-77.

Our *Purāṇa* defines indifference (*upekṣā*) as not dissuading a man from acts of injustice, personal vices (*vyasana*) or a battle, as is done by Hiḍimbā in relation to her brother (in the case of his fight with her beloved Bhīma).[341] Thus the policy of showing lack of interest, propounded by the *Agni Purāṇa*, amounts, in our opinion, to a policy of neutrality. This cannot be compared to the modern concept of neutrality which is adopted even by powerful states. It is just only a time-saving device to get prepared to attack one's enemy in future.

The policy of creating illusions with or without incantations (*māyā* and *indrajāla*) is intended to frighten away the enemies.[342] The methods employed are putting up of strange sights, shadow of ghosts, demons, falling meteors, false rains of arms, fire, stone and similar other spectacles of divine wrath; and creation through incantations of a vision of a huge invading army, etc. All these show that the people in our period are very superstitious, and they have a deep faith in omens and portents and magical rites and rituals. The Muslim invaders may have taken advantage of these superstitions of the Hindus.

The *Agni Purāṇa* introduces the principle of three types of strength or energies, as expounded in the *Arthaśāstra*.[343] It states that success can be achieved through human efforts and divine blessings, and offers the example of agriculture which depends both on the toil of the farmer as well as the divine rain.[344] But generally the *Agni Purāṇa* seems to favour human efforts. It lays down, like Yājñavalkya, that divine favour is nothing but the result of one's own good efforts of the past life. Thus if the king wants prosperity in this and the next life he should adopt an active life full of exertions.[345] The hope of future is held before the king to make him perform his 'exacting' duties.[346] It agrees with Manu that divine ways are beyond comprehension, and hence one should rely on his own good efforts.[347] Furthermore, it lays down that great persons have also called the human effort as the better of the two, and so it advises the king to cast off laziness.[348] The ideas as expressed by our text are echoed in the *Yaśastilaka* of Somadeva Sūri, who provides good similies to illustrate the point. He states that the crow leisurely sits on the head of one (meaning his death thereby), who depends on divine blessings rather than on his own efforts, just as it sits on the head of a sculptured lion;[349] divine help and personal exertions often help one another, and they are mutually related as medicine and life.[350] So Somadeva Sūri, like the *Agni Purāṇa*, advises the king to trust his own strength of arm and mind and not divine help.[351] As fate is beyond the range of human senses, personal effort should be the guiding principle of human activity. Other Jain works such as the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* and the Jain *sūtras* accord equal position to both human efforts and divine favours.[352]

---

[340] *Agni*, 234.4-7 ; *VDP*, II.147.1-3.
[341] *Ibid.*, 241.66.
[342] *Ibid.*, 234.8-16, 241.63-65 and 241.67-68.
[343] *Ibid.*, 241.1.
[344] *Ibid.*, 226.4.

26

We are told that human effort is based on three types of energies gained through influence, prowess and counsel.[353] Our *Purāṇa* repeats the old *Arthaśāstra* view that the strength gained through consultation is the best of all the three powers and refers to Bṛhaspati who gained victory through it over the demons, and possessed zeal as well as influence. It asks the king to bring his enemies under control by a judicious use of his three energies.[354] The *Viṣṇudharmottara* introduces religious dogmatism and adds the divine power (*daivīśakti*) to the traditional three powers, and states that all the energies issue forth from Viṣṇu without whose lusture none is capable of protecting the people.[355] Compared to the view of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* the ideas of our *Purāṇa* seem to be rational.

---

[345] *Ibid.*, 226.1.

[346] *Ibid.*, 235.1: *ajasra karma...*

[347] *Ibid.*, 225.33; *Manu*, 7.205; *VDP*, II. 65.75; *Matsya*, 221.12.

[348] *Ibid.*, 226.1.

[349] *Yaśas.*, III. 3.50.

[350] *Ibid.*, III. 3.61-63: *tatra daivaṁ nṛpānyatra pradhānaṁ pauruṣaṁ bhavet, ... parasparopakāreṇa jīvitauṣadhayoriva, daivapaurūṣayorvṛttiḥ phalajanmani manyatām.*

[351] *Ibid.*, III. 3.53: *yeṣāṁ bāhubalaṁ nāsti yeṣāṁ nāsti manobalaṁ teṣāṁ, chandrabalaṁ deva kiṁ kuryādambara sthitaṁ.*

[352] Handiqui, K. K., *op. cit.*, p.147.

[353] Treasury according to Kauṭilya, and treasury and coercive power according to Kāmandaka and Sōmadeva Sūri..

[354] *Agni*, 241.60; cf. *KNS*, 15.1.

The *Agni Purāṇa* thus bases inter-state relations on four traditional principles: theory of the circle of twelve states, the sixfold policy, the seven expedients, and the three types of energies required in the king. It is apparently influenced by the *arthaśāstra-smṛti* tradition but has a leaning towards the views of Kauṭilya, which makes its approach to inter-state relationship more sensible.

---

[355] *VDP*, II. 71.11-12.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

The *Agni Purāṇa* is indebted to various texts, compiled between the eighth and the tenth century. Its borrowings from them are generally verbatim, but sometimes they are summarised and sometimes truncated in such a way as to become beyond recognition. The main reason for the adoption of materials from different sources seems a desire on the part of the compiler to make the *Agni Purāṇa* encyclopaedic. The contents of our *Purāṇa* suggest that it was finally compiled between the ninth and the first half of the eleventh century somewhere in Bihar or West Bengal, where this work seems to have enjoyed considerable prestige among the people. Its popular nature led the scholar king Vallālasena to reject its authenticity, but as bad coin drives out good coin so the newly compiled *Purāṇa* drove out the genuine *Āgneya Purāṇa* into South India.

As regards the views of the *Agni Purāṇa* on polity, they are based on the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, the *Matsya Purāṇa* and the law-books of Yājñavalkya and Nārada. We have not been able to trace out the source from which the chapters on the science of gaining victory in war and the branch of astrology pertaining to it are derived.

The traditional *saptāṅga* theory of the state continues to be popular with the *Agni Purāṇa*, though some contemporary texts add a few new elements to it. According to our *Purāṇa* the seven limbs of the state are mutually interdependent, but the king should pay the greatest attention to the protection and development of the kingdom (*rāṣṭra*).

Kingship being the only form of government known in the period under our review, no other system is discussed. The king is still regarded as the root of the state, but we find a general decline in his power and prestige. It is partly on account of the rise of the brāhmaṇas in power and wealth and partly on account of the rise of the new ruling dynasties from humble origins. Our *Purāṇa* advocates a large number of rich gifts to the brāhmaṇas, makes them immune from taxes and lays down that half of the revenue should be made over to them. The history of the period shows that some brāhmaṇas established principalities of their own, and probably due to the efforts of the great Kumārilabhaṭa and Śaṁkarāchārya came to be invested with the supernatural power of making or unmaking even gods. On the other hand the *Agni Purāṇa* concedes some political and military rights to the śūdras, vaiśyas and the members of the mixed castes. So the sole claim of the kṣatriyas to rule and fight came to be vigorously questioned in our period.

However, whosoever becomes a king, our *Purāṇa* expects him to possess some good qualities. It further provides that princes should be trained in the art of government and other branches of knowledge from their childhood. Before he becomes a king, the prince is required to undergo a formal consecration, which is based on coronation in the *Brāhmaṇas* and the epics but ridden with more ritualism.

The duties and functions of the king are varied. He still enjoys certain rights and privileges, but some important royal functions are assigned to his officers and ministers. Such a primary duty as the protection of people is to be performed by the feudatories, and the army is to be commanded by high functionaries. The king thus looses his leadership of the fighting line and is reduced to only a symbolic banner for rallying his troops in the battlefield. So the king is not given those onerous tasks which are entrusted to him in the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya. He is represented to be rather weak and ease-loving and naturally suspicious of his ministers and his wives, particularly of those who have sons.

The ministers appear to be more powerful, but are nowhere instructed to work in a team. The list of officers is not as long as the Maurya or the Gupta counterpart. The provision for such officers as warder (*pratīhāra*) and the betel-bearer (*tāmbūladhārī*) marks the beginnings of a medieval royal court (*durbār*).

The king is the head of the judicial administration, but the punishment for violating his rights and privileges is not so severe as in the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* on which the legal system of the *Agni Purāṇa* is largely founded. The king is not free to administer justice as he likes, and is enjoined to return thirty times the fine, illegally imposed on a person, to the brāhmaṇas.

War is the main preoccupation of the government in the *Agni Purāṇa.* The idea of a fourfold army still holds the ground, but actually chariots go out of regular use. Our *Purāṇa* places greater reliance on foot-soldiers and the cavalry than on the elephants. Rules for training in archery are discussed in detail, and betray the popularity of horse-archery. Instructions for the use of important weapons and training of soldiers are given, but more trust is placed in the efficacy of spells and charms which form a science called the *yuddhajayārṇavīyajyotiṣà* and the *saṁgrāmavijayavidyā* in the early medieval period. Tantricism and undue faith in astrology thus mar the drive and initiative needed in war. Our *Purāṇa* states some moral principles of war but at the same time recommends treacherous warfare known as *māyā* and *indrajāla.* The former conforms to the *smṛti* tradition and the latter to the *arthaśāstra* tradition. In the field of inter-state relationship our *Purāṇa* takes the view of Kāmandaka as its model.

The sources of income and expenditure are discussed, but the treatment is not adequate. Gifts to the brāhmaṇas constitute a great drain on the state resources, although it is very doubtful whether half of the revenue was actually distributed among the brāhmaṇas.

Administration at the lower levels is not described fully, but a committee of five headed by the *mahattara* is provided. The epigraphs show that such a body is prominent in the administrative system of our period.

The political organisation outlined in our *Purāṇa* seems to be the result of an attempt to synthesise the *arthaśāstra* and the *smṛti* traditions, both of which seem to enjoy authority in early medieval times. But the resultant is not a solid structure able to withstand the onslaughts of the Turkish invaders ; on the other hand it is a fabric rendered weak by the use of tāntric spells, astrology and superstitions for gaining victory in war.

APPENDIX

In the following pages (a), (b), (c), and (s) denote first, second, third line of the verse and the summary of the verse respectively.

I The chapters and verses of earlier *Purāṇas* and *Upapurāṇas* quoted by the *Agni Purāṇa* :—

(i) *Matsya Purāṇa*

Matsya	*Agni*
4.45	18.20
.46(a)	.21(b)
.47	.22
.54(b)-55(a)	.29
5.13(b)	.30(a)
.19(b)	.34(b)
.22(a)	.36(a)
109.4-5(a)	111.2(b)-3
.6(a)	.4(a)
.8-9(a)	.5-6(a)
105.20(b)	.7(a)
.23	.9
106.8 s	.10(b)-11(a)
105.54	.11(b)-12(a)
180.23(b) s	112.3(a)
.28-29(a)	.3(b)-4
181.4(b)	.5(b)
185.24-25(a)	113.2-3(a)
17.34(a)	117.48(b)
.35	.49(a)
239.2-3	228.1-2
.6(b)	.3(a)
.8(b)	.3(b)
.12(a)	.4(a)
.15(b)	.5(a)
.20(a-b)	.5(b)-6(a)
.21	.6(b)-7(a)
240.2	.7(b)-8(a)
.11	.8(b-c)
241.2-4(a)	229.1(b)-3(a)
.4(b)-6(a)	.4-5
.8(b)-10(a)	.6-7
.6(b)-8(a)	.8-9
.10(b)-14	.10-14(a)
.17(b)-18	16(b)-17
.19(b)-31(a)	.18-29
242.2(a)	230.1(a)
.2(b) s	.2(a)
.7(a)	.4(b)
.11(b)	.7(b)
.14(a)	.9(a)
.15(b)	.9(b)

Matsya	*Agni*
.27(b)	.13(c)
228.6-7	263.11(b)-13(a)
.8(b)	.13(b)
.11(a)	.14(a)
.12(a)	.14(b)
229.1(a)	.15(a)
.2(a)	.15(b)
230.1	.16(b)-17(a)
232.1	.19
233.1	.20(b)-21(a)
234.1	.22
236.6	.28(b)-29(a)
237.1-2(a)	.29(b)-30
.4(b)-5(a)	.31
12.29(a)	273.19(a)
.31-32(a)	.21-22(a)
.33(b)-34	.23-24(a)
.36	.25
.48(b)-53(a)	.33-37
23.23-27	274.2(b)-7(a)
.28(c)	.7(b)
24.33(b)	.15(a)
.34(b)	.16(a)
43.13(b)	275.4(b)
.24	.7(b)-8(a)
44.61-62(a)	.27(b)-28(a)
.72(b)-75(a)	.29-31
.77	.34
.78(b)-79(a)	.35
.80(a)	.36(a)
45.1(a)	.37(b)
.3(a)	.40(a)
47.13-14	276.3-5(a)
48.1(a)	277.1(a)
.8(b)	.5(a)
.10(b)	.5(b)
.101(b)	.16(a)
.103(a-b)	.16(b)-17
49.5(b)-6(a)	278.4
.43(b)	.15(b)
50.5(b)	.21(a)
.46(b)-47(a)	.36(b)-37(a)

(ii) *Śiva Purāṇa*

Śiva	*Agni*
V. 30.21-22	18.14(b)-15
.25	.21(a)
.28-29	.22(b)-23
.33	.25
.35-36 s	.27
V. 37.21-24	373.6(b)-9
.28-29	.10-11
.42	cf.12(b)
.43	.13
.33	.14(a)
.46(b)	cf.16(a)
.47	.16(b)
.46(a)	.20(b)
.51	374.1(a)
.52(a)	.1(b)
.52(b)-53(a)	.3
.57	.7
.58	.8(b)
.60	375.4
.63-66	376.2(b)-5(a)
V. 38.16	.9(a)

(iii) *Vāyu Purāṇa*

Vāyu	*Agni*
70.9(a)	19.25(b)
106.83	106.39(a)
110.2	115.1
.3 s	.2(a)
105.31(b-c)	.2(b)-3(a)
.17	.3(b)-4(a)
.9(b-c)	.4(b)-5(a)
.16	.5(b)-6(a)
.8(b)-9(a)	.6(b)-7(a)
.25(a)	.7(b)
.11(b)	.8(b)
110.17	.9
.23	.13(b)-14(a)
.24(a) s	.14(b)
111.5	.15(b)-16(a)
.6(a)	.17(a)
.9(b)	.17(b)
110.10-12(a)	.20-22(a)
111.7(a)	.23(a)

Vāyu	*Agni*
.42	.25(b)-26(a)
.20(a)	.28(a)
.84(a)	.31(b)
.25	.35-36
.26(b)	.37(a)
30(a)	.38(a)
.17	.40
quoted by the *Tīrthaprakāśa*	.42(a)
105.29(a)	.42(b)
quoted by the *Tīrthaprakāśa*	.43(b)
110.25(a)	.46(b)
112.8(b)	.54(a)
.7-8(a)	.54(b)-55
.9-11(a) s	.56(b)-58(a)
110.51-53	.64-66
.63	.67(a)
.77(a)	.69(a)
quoted by the *Tīrthaprakāśa*	.69(b)-70(a)
111.80(b)	.72(a)
108.86(a)	116.9(b)
.89(a)	.10(b)
110.60	.40(b)-41(a)
.59(b-c)	.41(b)-42(a)
85.4(a)	273.5(b)
.5(b)	.6(a)
.19(b-c)	.8(b)-9(a)
86.24(b)-28(a)	.12-15
90.27(b)-29	274.8-9(a)
.33	.9(b)-10(a)
91.5	.13
93.16(b)-17(a)	.22(b)-23(a)
94.49(b)	275.9(a)
95.20	.14
.38	.18(b)-19(a)
.40(b)-41(a)	.20
97.73(b)-74(a)	276.10(b)-11(a)
99.134(a)	278.7(a)
.139(b)	.8(b)
.166(b)	.15(b)
.299(a)	.31(b)
.299(b)	.33(a)
11.16(b)	373.4(a)
.15(b)	.4(b)
10.92	.19

(iv) *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*

Viṣṇu	*Agni*
VI. 5.64(a)	1.5(a)
.65(a)	.5(b)
V. 1.34(a)	.15(a)
II. 1.3	18.1(a)
I. 13.2	.7(a)
.3	.8(a)
.4	.8(b)
.5(a)	.9(a)
.5(b)-6 s	.9(b)
.6-8	.10-12
I. 15.76(a)	.28(b)
.77	.29
.107-109	.32-34(a)
.111-112(a)	.35-36(a)
.112(b)-113(a) s	.36(b)
.113(b)-114(a)	.37
.115(b)-116(a)	.38(b)-39(a)
.120(a)	.40(b)
.121(b)	.41(a)
.122(b)-124	.42(b)-44
.133(b)	19.2-3(a)
.136(b)-137(a)	.3(b)-4(a)
.137(b)-138(a) s	.4(b)
.141(b)	.5(b)
.142	.6(a) and 7(a)
.143(a)	.7(b)
I. 21.1	.8(b)-9(a)
.2(a)	.9(b)
.6(b)-7(a)	.12
.7(b)	.13(a)
.13(b)	.14(a)
.14(b)-15(a) s	.14(b)
.15(a)	cf .15(a)
.25(a)	.18(a)
I. 5.19(b)-23(a)	20.1(a)-4(b)
.24-25(a)	.5-6(a)
.26(a)	cf .6(b)
I. 7.44 s	.8(a)
I. 8.15(a)	.9(a)
I. 7.32-34	.17(b)-20(a)
II. 1.7-8(a)	107.1(b)-2
.12 s	.3(b)
.13-14 s	.4
.24(b)-25(a)	.9
.26 s	.10
.38-40	.15(b)-18(a)

Viṣṇu	*Agni*
.41 s	.18(b)
.42(b)-43(a) s	.19
II. 2.5-6	108.1-2
.7 s	.3(a)
.8	cf .3(b)-4(a)
.9(b)-18(a)	.4(b)-13(a)
.18(b)-20(a) s	.13(b)-14(a)
.23(a)	.14(b)
.24-25(a)	.15-16(a)
.26(b) second half	.16(b) second half
.30(a)	.18(a)
.31(b)-32(a)	.18(b)-19(a)
.34 s	.19(b)
.35	.20
.38-43	.21(b)-27(a)
.47(a)	.28(b)
.50 s	.29(b)
.50(b)-51(a)	cf .30(a)
.51(b)	.30(b)
.53 s	.31(a)
.56	.32(b)-33(a)
II. 3.1(a)	118.1(a)
.1(b)-2(a) s	.1(b)
.2(b)-3	.2-3(a)
.6(b)-8(a)	.3(b)-5(a)
.10(b)	.6(b)
.11 s	.7(a)
.12(a)	.7(b)
.15(a)	.8(c)
.27-28 s	119.1
II. 4.1(b)	.2(a)
.3(a)	.2(b)
.5(b)	.3(b)
.7	.4
.15(b)-16(a) s	.5(b)
.17(a)	.6(a)
.23	.8
.26(a)	.9(b)
.30(b)-31(a) s	.10(b)
.41	.13
.48	.15
.50(a)	.16(a)
.52(a)	.17(a)
.53(a)	.17(b)
.57(a)	.18(a)
.60(a)	.19(a)
.63(a)	.20(b)
.87	.24(b)

Viṣṇu	*Agni*
.89(b)	.25(a)
.91(b)	.25(b)
.92	.26
.95(a)	.27(b)
.96-97 s	.28
II. 5.1	120.1
.2(b-c)-3(a)	.2-3(a)
.13(a)	.4(a)
II. 2.59	.13
II. 7.26(a)	.15(a)
.27(a)	.15(b)
.28(b)-31	.16(b)-19
.40	cf .20
.41(a)	.21(a)
II. 8.2-4	.21(b)-24(a)
.6(b)-8(a)	.24(b)-26(a)
.5 s	.26(b)
.17(a)	.27(a)
.99-101(a)	.27(b)-29
.110 s	.30(a)
II. 10.2	.31(b)-32(a)
III. 5.19	.32(b)
II. 12.1	.33(b)-34(a)
.7	.34(b)-35(a)
.16(a)	.36(a)
.16(b) s	.36(b)
.37	.38(b)-39(a)
VI. 5.64(a)	379.8(b)
VI. 7.11(a)-12	.15(b)-17(a)
.15-16	.17(b)-19(a)
.22-24	.19(b)-22(a)
.28(b)	.22(b)
.29 s	.23(a)
.30-31	.23(b)-25(a)
.33(b)	.25(b)
.45	.26(b)-27(a)
.47 s	.27(b)
.50-51(a)	.28-29(a)
.48(a)	.29(b)
.53-54(a)	.30-31(a)
.55 s	.31(b)
.95	.32
II. 13.57 s	380.5(a)
.61-62	.6-7
.66-76	.8-18
.79(a)	.19(c)
.80-81	.20-21
.85-86	.22-23

Viṣṇu	*Agni*
.91-95	.24-28
.97	.29
.87-90	.30-33
.98-99	.34-35
.101-103	.36-38
II. 14.7-9 s	.39-40
.12-13	.41-42
.27(a)	.44(a)
.29-30(a)	.44(b)-45
II. 15.6 s	.47
.19	.49
.21	.50
.24 s	.51
.25	.52
.29	.53
.34-35	.54-55
II. 16.1 s	.56
.5-7	.57-59
.10(a)	.60(a)
.13(a)	.61(b)
.18(b)	.64
.19(b)-20(a)	.65
.22	.67

(v) *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
III. 340.33(b)	1.6(a)
I. 196.6-52	31.2-46
II. 80.1(b)-3	151.3(a)-5(a)
.5-8(a)	.6(b)-9
.9(b) s	.10(a)
II. 81.1	.10(b)-11(a)
.2-5	.12(b)-16(a)
.6(b)-8	.16(b)-18
II. 82.1(a)	152.1(a)
.30-31	.3-4
.34	.5
II. 85.2	153.1(b)-2(a)
.4-6 s	.2(b)-3(a)
.8	.3(b)-4(a)
.14 s	.5(b)
.19	.6(b)-7(a)
.23(b)-27(a)	.7(b)-11(a)
.29(b)	cf. .11(b)
II. 86.1	.12

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.7	.13
.9(b)-10(a)	.14(b)-15(a)
.10(b)-11 s	.15(b)
.13-14 s	.16
II. 87.1	154.1
.3(b)	.2(a)
.5	.2(b)-3(a)
.6(b)	.3(b)
.8(a)	.4(a)
.9(b)-10(a)	.4(b)-5(a)
.11(a)-14(a)	.5(b)-8
.16(a)	.9(a)
.19(b)	.11(b)
.22(a)	.12(a)
.28(b)	.13(a)
.29-30 s	.13(b)-14(a)
.31(b)	.14(b)
.33(b)-34(a)	.15
.35(a)	.16(a)
.36-37	.16(b)-18(a)
.38(b)-39(a)	.18(b)-19(a)
.40 s	.19(b)
II. 88.1-5 s	155.1-2
.22	.3(b)-4(a)
II. 89.12(a)	.14(b)
.13(a)	.15(a)
.19-20(a)	.16-17(a)
.21(b)	.17(b)
.22-25 s	.18-19(a)
.27(a)	.19(b)
.29	.20
.32-33 s	.21
.37(a)	.22(a)
.45(b)-47(a) s	.24
.49(a)	.25(b)
.50(a)	.26(a)
.50(b)-51 s	.26(b)
.52(a)	.27(a)
.56(b)-57(a)	.28(b)-29(a)
.58(a)	.29(b)
II. 79*.4(a)	156.2(b)
.5-6	.3-4
.10 s	.5(b)-6(a)
.7	.6(b)-7(a)
.11-12(a)	.8-9(a)
.14 s	9(b)-10(a)

---

* This whole chapter of the *VDP* is borrowed from the *Śaṅkha Smṛti*, chapt. 16.

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.16(b)-17(a)	.10(b)-11(a)
.19	.11(b)-12(a)
.18 s	.13(a)
.23	.14(b)
.25(a-c)	.15-16
II. 75.2	157.1(b)-2(a)
.3-4 s	.2(b)-3(a)
.5(a)	.3(b)
.5(b)-6(a) s	.4
.6(b)	.5(a)
.7-8 s	.5(b)-6(a)
.9-13	.6(b)-11(a)
.15-18(a)	.11(b)-14
.21-22	.15-16
II. 77.3-9	.17-23
.10(b)-15	.24-29(a)
II. 78.3	.39(b)-30
.15(a)	cf. .31(a)
II. 75.23	157.32
.24(a)	.33(a)
.25(b)	.34(a)
II. 76.1	.34(b)-35(a)
.2 s	.35(b)
.3(b)-5	.36-38(a)
.6 s	.38(b)
.8-9 s	.39(b)-40(a)
.10-11	.40(b)-42
II. 75.5(a)	158.23(b)
.18(b)-19(a)	.24(b)-25(a)
.15(a)	.65(b)
II. 76.13(b)	159.1(b)
.16(b)	.2(a)
.19-20(a)	.3(b)-4
.21(a)	.5(a)
.22(b) s	.5(b)
II. 78.18(a)	.6(b)
.19-20(a)	.7-8(a)
.21(a)-24	.8(b)-12(a)
.25 s	.12(b)
.28-30 s	.13-14
II. 130.25	160.4(b)-5(a)
II. 131.1(b)	161.1(b)
.11(a-b)	.4
.13	.6(b)-7(a)
.22(a)	.7(b)
.25	.8
.33-34	.11-13(a)
.36	.14

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.43-44	.15-16
.59	.17
I. 105.9	164.14
II. 73.6(a)	168.2(a)
.7-8(a) s	.2(b)-3(a)
.9(b)	.3(b)
.12(a)	.4(a)
.13(b)	.5(a)
.12(b)	.5(b)
.14 s	.6(a)
.15(a)	.6(b)
.15(b)	.7(b)
.16(a)	.8(a)
.16(b)	.9(a)
.18(a)	.9(b)
.18(b)	.10(a)
.19	.10(b)-11(a)
.24	.12
.27(a)-28(a)	.13(b)-14
.29	.15
.30(a)	.16(a)
.31-32 s	.16(b)
.33(a)	.17(a)
.34(a)	.17(b)
.35	.18
.36	.19(b)-20(a)
.40(b)-41	.20(b)-21
.47	.22
51(b)-62	.23-34
.63	.35
III. 234.13(b)-14(a)	.36
II. 73.64-68	.37-40
.69(b)-70(a)	169.1(b)-2(a)
.71	.2(b)-3(a)
.72(b)	.3(b)
.73(b)	.4(a)
.74(b)-77(a)	.4(b)-7(a)
.82	.7(b)-8(a)
.84-87(a)	.8(b)-11(a)
.88(b)	.12(a)
.89(a)	.12(b)
.89(b)-90(a)	.13(b)-14(a)
.90(b)-91 s	.14(b)
.92(b)-95(a)	.15-17
.98(b)	.18(b)
.100(b)	.19(a)
.101(b)	.19(b)
.109(b)-111(a)	.20-21

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.112(b)-115 s	.22-23(a)
.116(b)-119(a)	.23(b)-26(a)
.123(b)-124(a)	.26(b)-27(a)
.131(a)	.27(b)
.132(a)	.28(a)
.141(b)-146(a)	.29-33
.147(b)-149(a)	.34-35
.150(b)-156(a)	.36-41
.157(b)-161	170.1(b)-5
.163-164(a)	.6-7(a)
.165(b)-166(a)	.7(b)-8(a)
.168(b)-169(a)	.8(b)-9(a)
.169(b)-170 s	.9(b)
.171(b)-172(a)	.10
.174(b)-177(a)	.11-13
.181-182(a)	.14-15(a)
.185(b)-190(a)	.15(b)-20(a)
.191(b)-196(a)	.20(b)-25(a)
.198(b)	.27(b)
.200-201(a)	.28-29(a)
.201(b)-202 s	.29(b)
.203(b)-207(a)	.30-33
.219(a)	.34(b)
.207-209(a)	.35-36
.210-212	.37(b)-40(a)
.217(b)	.41(a)
.218 s	.41(b)
.220-221(a)	.42-43(a)
.222(a)	.43(b)
.223(a)	.44(a)
II. 74.2(a)	171.1(b)
.15(a)	.2(a)
.10(b)	.4(a)
.31(b)-33(a)	.4(b)-6(a)
.35(b)-38	.6(b)-9
.39(a)	.10(b)
.43(b)	.12(a)
.58(b)	.14(a)
.59(b)	.14(b)
.73	.17
II. 73.106-107 s	173.21(b)-22
.103(a)	.24(a)
III. 234.100	.38
.115	.43
.111	.44
.113-114	.45-46
.51	.48
III. 132.5-8	177.4(b)-9(a)

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
I. 163.2(b)-4(a)	188.7(b)-9(a)
.9	cf. .9(b)
I. 167.20(a)	200.6(a)
.24(b)	.7(b)
I. chapts. 166-167	cf. chapt. 200
III. 300.3(b)-7	209.33(b)-35
.13(b)	.36(a)
III. 301.9(b)	.37(b)
.10(b)-11(a)	.38
.12-13(a)	.39-40(a)
.14(b)-15(a)	.40(b)-41(a)
.15(b)-17(b) s	.42-43(a)
.18(a)	.43(b)
.19 s	44(a)
.20(a)	.44(b)
.20(b)-23 s	.45-46
.25(a)	.47(a)
.25(b)-26 s	.47(b)
.27(a)	.48(a)
.27(b)-28 s	.48(b)
III. 303.1(a)	211.59(a)
.5(b)-7(a)	.59(b)-61(a)
.8(a)	.61(b)
.8(b)	.62(b)
I. 165.13	216.13
II. 18.3-4	cf. 218.3-4
.2	.5
II. 19.1 s	.7
.3-5(a) s	.8
.5(b)	.9(b)
II. 20.1-2(a)	.10-11(a)
.3(a)	.11(b)
.5(a)	.12(a)
II. 21.2-5	.12(b)-15
.6-7 s	.17(a)
.8(b)-14(a)	.18(b)-24(a)
.16-17 s	.25
.34(b)	.30(b)
.38	.32
.42(a)	.33(a)
.42(b)-43 s	.33(b)
II. 22.4	219.2
.7	.3(b)-4(a)
.8-9 s	.4(b)-5
.10(a)	.6(a)
.26(b)-27	.9-10(a)
.28(b)-29	.10(b)-11
.30(b)-31(a)	.12

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.36(b)-37	.16(b)-17
.38(b)-39	.18-19(a)
.40	.20(b)-21(a)
.41(b)	.21(b)
.43(b)-44(a)	.23
.45-46(a)	.24-25(a)
.47(a)	.25(b)
.48(a)	.26(b)
.49	.27
.50(b)-56(a)	.28-33
.57	.34
.58 s	.35(a)
.60 s	.35(b)
.61(a)	.36(a)
.65(b)	.37(b)
.66-67 s	.38
.73-74 s	.40(a)
.81(a)	.41(b)
.87(b)	42(b)
.88(b)	.43(a)
.89(b)	.43(b)
.92(a)	44(b)
.93(a)	.45(a)
.98(b)-99(a)	.46
.100-101	.47-48
.104	cf. .49(b)-50(a)
.112-113(a)	.50(b)-51
.120	.52(b)-53(a)
.123(b)-126(a) s	.54-56(a)
.127-128	.56(b)-58(a)
.131(a)	.59(b)
.133	.60(b)-61(a)
.142(b)	.63(b)
.143-144 s	.64-65(a)
.147(b)-148(a)	.66
.150(b)	.67(a)
.151-173 s	.67(b)-72
II. 24.11(a)	220.1(b)
.12-39 s	.2-7
.40	.8
.41	cf. .9
.43(b)-44(a)	.10(b)-11(a)
.48(b)-49	.12-13(a)
.50-51	.14-15
.54-55(a) s	.16(a)
.55(b)	.16(b)-17(a)
.57(b)-58	.17(b)-18
.59(b)	.19(a)

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.61(b)-62(a)	.19(b)-20(a)
.65-66	.21-22
.69(b)-70(a)	.23
.71 s	.24(a)
II. 25.2(b)-3(a) s	221.1(b)
.3(b)	.2(a)
.6(b)	.3(a)
.9(a)	.3(b)
.8(b)	.4(b)
.10(b)	.5(a)
.12(a)	.5(b)
.16(b)	.6(a)
.18	cf. .6(b)
.20	.7
.21(b)	.8(a)
.23-25	.8(b)-11(a)
.28	cf. .11(b)
.26(a)	.12(a)
.35(a)	cf. .12(b)
.34(b)	.13(a)
.37(b)	.14(b)
II. 26.2(a)	222.1(b)-3
.6(a)	cf. .4(a)
.6(b)-7	.4(b)-5
.8-88 s	.6-10(a)
II. chapter 31 s	.10(b)-15(a)
II. 32.7	.15(b)-16(a)
.8 s	.16(b)
.9(b)	.17(a)
.14	.17(b)-18(a)
.17(a)	.18(b)
II. 33.1(a)	.19(a)
II. 34.5	.19(b)-20(a)
.6 s	.20(b)
.15(a)	.21(a)
.38(a)	.21(b)
.39-40(a)	.22-23(a)
II. 35.2-3 s	.24(a)
.22-23 s	.24(b)
II. 61.2-5(a)	223.1-4(a)
.7(b)	.4(b)
.10(b)	.5(a)
.12(b)-14(a)	.5(b)-7(a)
.21 s	.7(b)
.22	.8
.24-25	.9-10
.26 s	.11(a)
.28(b)-30(a)	.11(b)-13(a)

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.35(a)	.14(b)
.37	.15
.42-44(a)	.16-18(a)
.46-48	.18(b)-21(a)
.49 s	.21(b)
.50(b)	.22(a)
.51 s	.22(b)
.52 s	.23(a)
.53	.23(b)-24(a)
.54-55 s	.24(b)
.56(b)	.25(a)
.58(b)	.25(b)
.59(b)	.26(a)
.60(b)-63(a)	.26(b)-29(a)
.65-68	.30(b)-33
II. 62.1(b)-2	224.1(b)-2
.5(b)-6(a) s	.3(a)
.14(a)	.4(a)
.16(a)	.4(b)
.18(b)-31	.5-18(a)
II. 63.6(b)-7(a)	.18(b)-19(a)
II. 64.1-3	.19(b)-22
.20(b)-28	.23-31(a)
.29(b)	.31(b)
.31(b)-33(a)	.32-33
.36(b)-44	.34-41
II. 65.1-2(a)	.42(a-c)
.2(b)	225.1(a)
.3(b)	.1(b)
.4(b)	.2(a)
.5	.2(b)-3(a)
.7 s	.3(b)
.8(b)	.4(a)
.9(b)	.4(b)
.11(a)	.5(a)
.11(b) s	.5(b)
.13(b)-15	.6-8(a)
.17(a)	.8(b)
.18(b)-19	.9(b)-10
.20(b)-21(a)	.11
.21(b)-22(a)	cf. .12(a)
.26	.13
.27(b)	.14(a)
.29(a)	.14(b)
.31(b)-32	.15-16(a)
.37	.17(b)-18(a)
.39	.18(b)-19(a)
.41(a)	.20(b)

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.46	.21(b)-22(a)
.47(b)	.22(b)
.53-55(a)	.24-26(a)
.61-64	.27-30
.67 s	.31(a)
.71	.32
.75	.33(a-b)
.74(b) s	.33(c)
II. 66.1-2(a)	226.1-2(a)
.4 s	.2(b)
.7(a)	.3(a)
.7(b)-8(a) s	.3(b)
.8(b)	.4(a)
II. 67.2-4(a)	.5(b)-7(a)
II. 68.1	.9
.3(a)	.10(a)
II. 69.1 s	.12(a)
.2(a)	.12(b)
.3(a)	.13(a)
II. 70.6(a)	.14(b)
.10	.15
.17(b)	.16(a)
.18(a)	.16(b)
II. chapter 71 s	.17-20
II. 72.2-5	227.1(b)-5(a)
.14-16	.5(b)-8(a)
.17(b)-18	.9-10(a)
.21-22(b)	.10(b)-11
.25(a)	.12(a)
.26 s	.12(b)
.27(a)	.13(a)
.28-29	.13(b)-15(a)
.33-35	.15(b)-18(a)
.38	.18(b)-19(a)
.40-41(a)	.19(b)-20
.42 s	.21(a)
.46	.21(b)-22(a)
.49(b)-50(a) s	.22(b)
.50(b)-53(a)	.23-25
.53(b)-63(a) s	.26-27
.64	.28
.66-67	.29-30
.72(b)	.32(a)
.75(b)-76(a)	.32(b)-33(a)
.82-84	.33(b)-36(a)
.85 s	.36(b)
.94	.37
.102	.39

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.112(b)	.41(a)
.116(a)	.41(b)
.117 s	.42(a)
.118(a)	.42(b)
.119(a)	.43(a)
.121	.43(b)-44(a)
.129(b)	.44(b)
.130(a)	.45(a)
.137(b)	.45(b)
.138(a)	.46(a)
.138(b)-139(a) s	.46(b)
.141(b)	.47(a)
.142(b)	.47(b)
.143(a)	.48(a)
.143(b)-144(a)	.48(b)
.145(b)-146(a)	.49
.148(b)-149(a)	.50
.152(b)-153	.52-53(a)
.156(b)-157	.53(b)-54
.160	.55
.165	.56(b)-57(a)
.170(b)-172(a)	.57(b)-59(a)
.174(a)	.59(b)
.176	cf. .60(a)
.183-186	.60(b)-63(a)
.188(b)	.64(b)-66
II. 163.2-3	228.1-2
.6(a)	.3(a)
.8(a)	.3(b)
II. 164.1	231.1
.3(b)-22	.3-22
.23-35(a)	.24(b)-36
.36(b)-43	232.1-8(a)
.44(b)-60(a)	.8(b)-24(a)
.61 s	.24(b)
.65-66(a)	.26-27(a)
.74	.30(b)-31(a)
.76	.31(b)
.77	.32
.81(b)-82(a)	.33
.88	.34
.94(a)	.35(a)
.95-96(a)	.35(b)-36
.97 s	.37(a)
.99(a)	.37(b)
II. 173.5-6(a)	233.1(b)-2
.7-10(a)	.3-6(a)

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.17(a)	.6(b)
.22	.7
.45-46(a)	.8(b)-9
.54(b)	.10(b)
II. 145.3(a)	cf. .12(a)
.3(b)-4(a)	.12(b)-13(a)
.5(b)	.13(b)
.7	.14
.10-11(a)	.16(b)-17
.13(b)	.18(a)
.11(b)	.18(b)
.12	.19
.14 s	.20(a)
.13(a)	.20(b)
.15-19(a)	.21-25(a)
.20(b)-21(a)	.25(b)-26(a)
II. 146.1	234.1
.2 s	.2(a)
.3(a)	.2(b)
.4(b)-5(a)	.3
II. 147.1(b)-2	.5-6(a)
.3(a)	.7(b)
II. 148.2	.9
.4(b)-5	.11-12(a)
.7-8	.12(b)-14(a)
II. 149.2 s	.15
.2(b)	.16(a)
II. 151.1(a)	235.1(a)
.2(a)	.1(b)
.3	cf. .2(a)
.4-5(a)	.2(b)-3
.6(a)	.4(a)
.8-11 s	.4(b)-6(a)
.16(b)-17(a)	.8
.17(b)-19 s	.9
.20(b)-21	.10-11(a)
.26(b)-28(a)	.11(b)-13(a)
.31-32 s	.13(b)-14(a)
.33(a)	.14(b)
.36-38	.15-17
II. 176.2(a)	236.1(b)
.4(a)	.2(b)
.9-10	.3(b)-5(a)
.11 s	.5(b)
.26(b)	.13(b)
.27(b)	.14(a)
.28(b)	.14(b)
.30 s	.15(a)

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.51(a)	.20(a)
.53 s	.21(a)
.57	cf. .22(a)
.58(a)	.22(b)
II. 177.2(a)	.24(a)
.16-18	.27-29
.20(a)	.30(b)
.21-22(a)	.31(b)-32
.23 s	.33(a)
.24(b)-25	.33(b)-34
.28	.35
.29(b)-30(a)	.36
.31-32(a)	.37-38(a)
.34(b)	.40(a)
.37-39	.41(b)-44(a)
.43(b)-46(a)	.44(b)-47(a)
.47	.47(b)-48(a)
.48(a)	.49(a)
.49(a)-51	.49(b)-52(a)
.57	.52(b)-53(a)
.62(a)	.54(b)
.63	.55
.64 s	.56(a)
.65(a)	.56(b)
.77(b)	.58(b)
.79-80(a)	.59(b)-60
.81(a)	.61(a)
.82(a)	.61(b)
.84(a)	.62(a)
.85(a)	.63(a)
.87(a)	.64(a)
.92	.65
.93(b)	.66(a)
II. 8.4	243.2(b) and 3(b)
.5-6	.4-5
.7(b)-8	.6-7(a)
.11(b)	.8(a)
.12-13 s	.9
.14	.10
.15 and 17(a) s	.11
.16(b)	.12(a)
.17(b)-19(a) s	.12(b)-13(a)
.19(b)	.13(b)
.20(b)	.14(a)
.21(b)	.14(b)
.22 s	.15(a)
.23(b)	.15(b)
.24(b)	.16(a)

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.27(b)	.16(b)
.28 s	.17(a)
.30-34(a) s	.18-19
.34(b)-37(a)	.20-22
.38	.23
.39(b)	.24(a)
.40 s	.24(b)
.41(b-c)	.25(a-b)
.42 s	.26
II. 9.1-2(a)	244.1-2(a)
.3-11 s	.2(b)-6(a)
.13(a)	.6(c)
II. 13.1(a)	245.1(b)
.1(b)-3(a) s	.2
.5(b)	.3(a)
II. 14.1(a)	.3(b)
II. 16.1	.4(b)-5(a)
.3(b)-7(a)	.5(b)-9(a)
.10(b)	.9(b)
.11(b)	.10(a)
.12-18(a) s	.10(b)-11
.18(b)	.12(a)
.22 s	.12(b)
II. 17.1 s	.14(b)
.28(b)-29	.24-25(a)
.31(b)	.26(a)
.33(a)	.26(b)
.34 s	.27
II. 15.1-6(a)	246.1(b)-6
.7(a)	.7(a)
.7(b)-15(a)	.7(b)-11(a)
.15(b)	.11(b)
.22	.15
II. 29.8(a)	247.1(b)
.9(b)-10(a)	.2(b)-3(a)
.15(b)	.5(a)
.19(b)-20(a)	.7
.20(b)	.8(b)
.28(a)	.13(a)
.84-91(a)	.16(b)-23
II. 30.1	.24
.3(a)	.25(a)
.14(b)-15(a)	.25(b)-26(a)
.18(b)-19	.26(b)-27
.22(b)	.28(a)
.20-21(a)	.28(b)-29
.26(a)	.30(b)
.31-32 s	.31

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
II. 178.2-5(a)	249.1-4(a)
.6	.4(b)-5(a)
.10	.7
II. 179.1 s	.9(b)
.2-6	.10-14
.7(b)-28	.15-36(a)
.29(b)-30	.36(b)-37
II. 180.1(a)	250.1(a)
.2(a)	.1(b)
.3-9(a)	.2-8(a)
.10-15(a)	.8(b)-13(b)
.16(b)	.14(b)
.17(b)-21(b)	.15(b)-19(b)
II. 181.1	251.1
.5(a)-14(c)	.2(a)-12(a)
.15(b)	.12(c)
II. 182.1-4	252.1-4
.6-12	.8-14
.13-27(a)	.16-30(a)
II. 183.23(b)	.31(b)
.27(b)-28	.32-33(a)
II. 124.3-5(a)	259.3-5(a)
.12-13	.8-9
.14 s	.10(a)
.15-26(a)	.10(b)-21
.27-38(a)	.22(b)-33
.40(a) s	.34(b)
.40(b)-41	.35-36(a)
.43(b)-44	.37-38(a)
.45(a)	.39(a)
.48	.39(b)-40(a)
.57(b)-58(a)	.40(b)-41(a)
.59(b)-61(a)	.41(b)-43(a)
.62(b)-66(b)	.43(b)-47(b)
.69(a)-70(a)	.48(a)-49(a)
.70(b)	.50(a)
.71(b)-74(b)	.50(b)-53
.76(b)-79(a)	.54(a)-56
.80(b)-81(a)	.57
.82-83	.58-59
.85	.60
.86(b)	.61(a)
.89(a)-92	.61(b)-65(a)
.100(b)	.65(b)
.95(b)	.66(a)
.97(b)-99(a)	.66(b)-68(a)
.100(b)-101(a)	.68(b)-69(a)
.103(b)-104(a)	.69(b)-70(a)

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.105	.70(b)-71(a)
.107(b)	.71(b)
.109(b)	.75(a)
.110(b)-112(b)	.76(a)-77(b)
.113(b)	.78(a)
.120(b)-121(a)	.78(b)-79(a)
.123	.79(b)-80(a)
.126-127	.80(b)-82(a)
.128(b)	.82(b)
.129(a)	.83(a)
.130(b)	.83(b)
.131(b)-137(a)	.84-89(b)
.139(a)	.90(a)
.141(b)	.90(b)
.142(b)	.91(a)
.143 s	.91(b)
.145(a)	.92(a)
.146-147(a)	.92(b)-93(a)
.149	.93(b)-94(a)
.151(b)	.94(b)
.153(b)-154(a)	.95
.156(b)	.96(a)
.157(b)-158(b)	.96(b)-97
.159(b)-160	.98(b)-99
II. 125.1-12(a)	260.1(b)-12
.13-14	.13-14
.18(a)	.15(b)
.23-24	.16(b)-18(a)
.25(b)	.18(b)
.30-31	.19(b)-21(a)
.37-38(a)	.21(b)-22
.39(b)-41(a)	.23-24
.45-50	.25-30
.56(b)-57(a)	.31
.58	.32
.59	.33(b)-34(a)
.60(b)	.34(b)
.63(b)-64(a)	.35
.65(a)-66(a)	.36-37(a)
.61-62(a)	.37(b)-38
.63(a)	.39(a)
.66(b)-67(a)	.39(b)-40(a)
.71 s	.40(b)
.72-74(a)	.41-43(a)
.80(a)	.44(b)
.83(a)	.45(a)
.84(b)	.45(b)
.86(b)	.46(a)

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.87(b)	.46(b)
.89-93(a)	.47-51(a)
.96(b)-98	.51(b)-53
.99(b)	.54(a)
.101(a)-104(a)	.54(b)-59(a)
.110(b)-111(a)	.60
.113	.61
.115 s	.62(b)
.116-118(a)	.63-65(a)
.124(b)-132(b)	.65(b)-73
.136	.74
.137(b)-138(a)	.75
.139(a)-142(a)	.76-79(a)
.145	.79(b)-80(a)
.149(a)	.80(b)
.150(a)-151(a)	.81-82(a)
.152(b)	.82(b)
.155	.83
.162	.84
II. 126.1(a)	261.1(b)
.2-3 s	.2
.8-9(a)	.3-4(a)
.10	.4(b)-5(a)
.14-15	.5(b)-7(a)
.19(a)	.9(a)
.20(b)	.10(b)
.22(a)	.11(a)
.24(a)	.11(b)
.26-28	.12-14
.30-31(a)	.15(a)-16(a)
.32(a)	.16(b)
.43-44	.17-18
.56-57(a)	.19(a)-20(a)
.58-61	.20(b)-24(a)
II. 127.1-3	262.1(b)-4(a)
.5-7(a)	.7-9(a)
.8(b)-9(a)	.9(b)-10(a)
.11	.10(b)-11(a)
.13(b)	.12(b)
.15	.13
.22(a)	.15(a)
.27	.17(b)-18(a)
.24(a)	.19(a)
.40(b)-45	.21(b)-25
II. 128.1(a)	263.1(a)
.4(a)	.1(b)
.5(a)	.2(a)
.6(b)-7(a)	.3

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
II. 129.6(a)	.6(a)
.9(a)	.7(a)
II. 138.1	.19
II. 139.1(a)	.20(b)
.2(a)	.21(a)
II. 140.1	.22
II. 141.1	.23(b)-24(a)
II. 142.3(a)	.26(a)
II. 143.1-2(a)	.26(b)-27
.5 s	.28(a)
.6(a)	.28(b)
II. 144.1-2(a)	.29(b)-30
.4(b)-5(a)	.31
.8-9 s	.32(a)
II. 92.3-17(a)	264.9-23(a)
.21(b)-24	.24(b)-27
.25-26 s	.28
II. 104.16	265.3
.34	.6
.116(a)	.17(a)
.117(a)	.17(b)
II. 105.1(b)-2	266.1-2(a)
.3(b)-4(a)	.2(b)-3(a)
.5	.3(b)-4(a)
.6 s	.4(b)
.7-8	.5-6
.10(b)-11	.7-8(a)
.12(b)-13(a)	.8(b)-9(a)
.14-18(a)	.9(b)-13
.19	cf .14
.20-21(a)	.15-16(a)
.22(b)	.17(a)
.23(b)	.18(a)
.24	.19
.25(b)	.20(a)
II. 106.1(b)	267.1(b)
.9	.2
II. 107.1(a)	.7(a)
.2(a)	.7(b)
.4	.9
.6(a)	.10(a)
.6(b)-14 s	.10(b)-12
Chapter 108 s	.13(b)
II. 109 s	.14
II. 110.2	.15
.5(b)	.16(b)
II. 110 s	.17-27
II. 155.4(b)	268.3(a)

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.14(a)	.4(b)
II. 157.3-4	.6-7
.12(b)-14	.10(b)-12
II. chapter 158 s	.13-16
II. 159.3(b)	.17(a)
.9(b)-10(a)	.17(b)-18(a)
.11	.18(b)-19(a)
.13	.20
.36(b)-39(a)	.24(b)-27(a)
.40(b)	.28(a)
.41(b)	.28(b)
.42(b)-43(a)	.29
.44(a)	.30(a)
.45-46(a) s	.30(b)
.46(b)	.31
II. 160.3-7	269.3-7
.8(b)-11	.8-11(a)
.12(a)	.12(a)
.12(b)-16(a)	.13(b)-17(a)
.16(b)	.18(b)
.17-25	.19(b)-28(a)
.26-28(a)	.30(b)-32
.28(b)-31	.33(b)-36
I. 195.4-7	270.1-4
.8-17	.6-15
II. 56.2-3(a)	279.3-4(a)
.4-6(a)	.4(b)-6
.6(b)-8 s	.7
.9	.8
.12-13	.10(b)-12(a)
.17-21(a)	.14(b)-18
.22-26	.19-23
.27(b)-59(a)	.24-55
.60(b)	.56(a)
.63	.56(b)-57(a)
.64(b)	.58(a)
.66-72(a)	.58(b)-63
.72(b)-73	280.1-2(a)
.80(a)	.5(a)
.81(b)	.5(b)
.83(b)	.6(a)
.86-89	.6(b)-10(a)
.90(b)-91	.10(b)-11
.92(b)-100	.12-20(a)
.101(b)	.22(a)
.103(a)	.22(b)
.102(b)	.23(a)
.103(b)	.23(b)

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.106	.24
.105(b)	.25(a)
.107-108(a)	.25(b)-26
.108(b)-123	.28-43(a)
.124 s	.43(b)
.125-127	.44-46
.128-130 s	.47-48
II. 30.5	282.3(b)-4(a)
.6(b)	.4(b)
.7(b)	.5(a)
.8(b)-9(a)	.5(b)-6(a)
.10(b)-11(a)	.6(b)-7(a)
.14(b)-16(a)	.7(b)-9(a)
.18(b)-21(a)	.10-12
.22	.13(a)
.32	.13(b)-14
II. 10.1(b)	287.1(b)
.2(b)	.2(a)
.3(b)	.2(b)
.4(b)	.3(a)
.6(b)-7(a)	.3(b)-4(a)
.18(a)	.4(b)
.19 s	.5(a)
II. 48.1	.5(b)-6(a)
II. 49.1(b)-6	.6(b)-11
.7(b)-15(a)	.12-19
.16	.20
.18-21	.21-24
.23-24	.25-26
.26	.27
.29(b)-30(a)	.28
.34-37(a)	.29-32(a)
.39(a)	.33(a)
.40(a)	.33(b)
II. 11.2-7	289.1(b)-6
.20-21(a)	.8-9(a)
II. 46.1(b)-2(a)	.11(b)-12(a)
.4-10	.12(b)-19(a)
.12(a)	.19(b)
.13	.20
.15-17	.21-23
.19-31	.24(b)-37(a)
.33-40	.37(b)-45(a)
.43-51	.46-54
II. 47.16(b)	290.4(b)
.17(b)	.5(a)
.27	.7
.29(a)	.8(a)

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.33(a)	.8(c)
II. 50.8	291.2
.10(a)	.3(a)
.9(b)	.3(b)
.10(b)	.4(a)
.19(b)	.5(b)
.59(b)	.15(a)
.56(b)	.15(b)
.60-65(a)	.16-21(a)
.66(a)	.21(b)
.78(b)-79(a)	.22(b)-23(a)
II. 42.7(a)	292.3(a)
.34(b)	.9(a)
.35(b)-36(a)	.10
.38(a)	.12(a)
.41-43 s	.13-14(a)
.50-57(a)	.14(b)-21
II. 43.2	.23
.3(b)-4(a)	.24
.6-8(a)	.25-27(a)
.10	.27(b)-28(a)
.12(a)	.28(b)
.13-14(a)	.29-30(a)
.16(a)	.30(b)
.15 s	.31(a)
.19 s	.31(b)
.21	.32
.22(a)	.33(b)
.23(b)	.34(b)
.24-25 s	.35
II. 44.5(a)	.37(a)
.8 s	.38(a)
III. 125.26(b)	305.1(a)
.8(a)	.2(a)
.9(a)	.2(b)
.10(a)	.3(a)
.11-13	.4-6
.16(a)	.9(a)
.18(b)-19	.10(b)-11
.20(b)-21(a)	.12(b)-13(a)
.22-23	.14-15
.26(a)	.16(a)
II. 113.18(a)	369.13(b)
.20(b)	.14(a)
.22(b)-26(a)	.15-18
II. 114.1(a)	.19(a)
.6-8	.21-23
II. 115.7	.28

Viṣṇudharmottara	*Agni*
.8 s	.29(a)
.9(a)	.29(b)
.10 s	.30
.12-14 s	.31(b)-32
.15-23(a)	.33-41(a)
.24-25 s	.42
.27(b)	.44(a)
.30(a)	.45(a)
.31 s	.45(c)
.38(a)	370.3(b)
.48(a)	.6(a)
.52(b)	.8(b)
.53(b)-64	.9(b)-20
.68(b)	.21(a)
.69 s	.21(b)
.73-74	.24-25
.75 s	.26(a)
.76	.26(b)-27(a)
.77 s	.27(b)
.78	.28
.84(a)	.34(a)
.86(b)	.36(a)
.89(a) s	.38(a)
.89(b)	.38(b)
.90-91 s	.39
.91(b)-94	.40-43(a)
II. 116.1(b)-5(a)	371.1(b)-5(a)
.6 s	.5(b)
.7-8(a)	.6-7(a)
.10	.8
.11(b)	.9(a)
.12-13 s	.9(b)-10(a)
II. 119.2(a)	.20(a)
.4(b)	.20(b)
.2(b)-4(a)	.21-22
.9(a)	.24(a)
.13(a)	.24(b)
.14	.25

(vi) *Harivaṁśa Purāṇa* s Chapter II	*Agni Purāṇa*, Chapt. 12 17.6(a)-17

(vii) *Śivadharma*, quoted in the *Dānamayūkha*, p. 5

tasmātribhāgaṁ vittasya jīvanāya prakalpayet,
bhāgadvayaṁ tu dharmārthamanityaṁ jīvitaṁ yataḥ.

Agni Purāṇa, 327.17

bhāgadvayaṁ cha dharmārthaṁkalpayejjīvanāya cha,
dhanasya bhāgamekaṁ tu anityaṁ jīvitaṁ yataḥ.

(viii) *Viṣṇudharma*	*Agni Purāṇa*
Chapt. 28 fol. 48(a)-59(b)	Chapt. 31*
Chapt. 93 fol. 213(a)-214(a)	Chapt. 172
Chapt. 41 fol. 86(a-b)	Chapt. 177.4 ff.
Chapt. 81 fol. 187(a)	Chapt. 248
Chapt. 69 fol. 138(b)	Chapt. 270
Chapt. 36 fol. 68(a)-69(a)	Chapt. 305*

(ix) *Viṣṇurahasya* quoted by the *Ācāramayūkha*, p. 101

Agni, 46.5-6(a)

(x) *Argalāstotra* of the

Devīmāhātmya .1	*Agni*, 185.14(b)-15(a)

Verses of Smṛti texts quoted profusely by the Agni Purāṇa

(i) *Manu Smṛti*

Manu	*Agni*
2.69	153.12
.52	.13
5.59(a)	157.1(b)
.83	.16
.89(a)	158.25(b)
.82(b)	.26(a)
.78	.28
.75(b)-76	.32-33(a)
.81(b)	.33(b)
.103(b)	.44(b)
.61-62	.60-61
6.23	160.4(b)-5(a)
.33(a)	.5(b)
.38(a)	161.2(b)
.39(a)	.3(a)
.43(b)-46	.4-7(a)
.54(a)	.7(b)
.56	.8
.61(a)	.10(b)
.66-67	.11-12
.69	.14
.76-77	.15-16

---

[*] These chapters also occur in the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, which according to Hazra has borrowed from the *Viṣṇudharma*, an earlier source. The *Agni Purāṇa* seems to borrow from the *Viṣṇudharmottara* but two of the verses 31.30(a), and 43(b) are found in the *Viṣṇudharma* and not in the *Viṣṇudharmottara*.

Manu	*Agni*
.92	.17
11.214	171.6(b)-7(a)
quoted by *Mit.* but not found in *Manu*	173.3
.80(a)	.7(a)
.127	.12
.93	.23(b)-24(a)
.151(a)	.24(b)
.152(b)	.25(a)
.104	.47
.107(a)	.49(a)
.178	.51(b)-52(a)
.212-214	175.18-20
7.47-48	362.24-25
11.94(a)	372.12(b)

(ii) *Nārada Smṛti*

Nārada	*Agni*
I. .8-15	253.1(b)-9(a)
.21-24(a)	.9(b)-12
ṛṇadāna 1	.13
aupanidhika 1	.14
saṁbhūya	.15
dattāpradānika 1	.16
abhyupetyaśuśruṣā 1	.17
vetanasyānupākarma 1	.18
asvāmivikraya 1	.19
vikrīyasaṁpradāna 1	.20
kṛtvanuśaya 1(a)	.21(a)
kṛtvanuśaya 2(a)	.21(b)
samayasyānupākarma 1	.22
kṣetravivāda 1	.23
stripuṁsayoga 1	.24
dattyavibhāga 1	.25
sāhasa 1	.26
vāgadaṇḍapāruṣya 1	.27
vāgadaṇḍapāruṣya 4	.28
dyūtasamāhvaya 1	.29
prakīrṇaka 1	.30
vyavahāradarśana 19(b)	.31(a)
vyavahāradarśana 20(b)	.31(b)
quoted by *Mit.* on *Yāj.*	.56(b)-57(a)
quoted by *Mit.* on *Yāj.*, 2.100	255.35
1.27	258.83(a-b)
.26 s	.83(c)

(iii) *Yājñavalkya Smṛti*

Yājñavalkya	*Agni*
3.25(a)	158.24(b)
.28-29	.36(b)-37(a)
.5(a)	.53(b)
.4	.54
.12(b)-13	.57-58(a)
1.142-151	162.9(b)-18
.228(b)-231	163.3(a)-6(a)
.232(b)-233	.6(b)-7
.234(b)-240	.8-13
.241-256	.14-29
.258-268(a)	.30-40(a)
.269-270	.40(b)-42
.295-308	164 whole chapter
.303	167.6(b)-7(a)
3.314(a)	171.8(b)
.320	.8(a)
.343	173.8
.260	.13(a)
.263	.13(b)-14(a)
.264	.14(b)
.270	.19(b)-20(a)
.305	.21(a)
.254	.24(b)-25(a)
1.204-205	210.30-31
2.1(a)	253.32(a)
.2-3	.32(b)-33(a)
.4-13	.33(b)-43(a)
.15-27	.43(b)-56(a)
Viś. 2.29*	.56(b)-57(a)
.28-29(a)	.57(b)-58
.30**	.59(a)
.31-33	.59(b)-62(a)
.36(a)	.62(b)
.37	.63
.39	.64
.38	.65
.40	.66
.41-44	254.1-4
.51	.5
.45-46	.6-7
.48-50	.8-10
.47	.11
.52-67	.12-27

* This verse is ascribed by *Mit.* to Nārada (*Mit.* on *Yāj.* 2.29)

**These verses are not to be found in the *Mitākṣarā*.

Yājñavalkya	*Agni*
.68-71 (a)	255.1-4 (a)
.72 (a)	.5 (a)
.76-77	.5 (b) -7 (a)
.73-75	.7 (b) -10 (a)
.78-83 (a)	.10 (b) -15
.84-87	.16-19
Viś. .90*	.20
.88-96	.21-29
.99	.30
Viś. .101-103*	.31-33
.100	.34
.101-107	.36-42
.108-113	.43 (b) -49
.114-118	256.1-5
.120-122	.6-8
.119	.9
.123-149	.10-36
.150-188	257.1-39
.190-203	.40-53
.204-222	258.1-19
.263	.20
2.223-227	.21-25
.231-238	.26-33
.240-245	.34-39
.249	.40
.251-262	.41-52
.264-271 (a)	.53-60 (a)
.272-274	.60 (b) -63 (a)
.276-277	.63 (b) -65 (a)
.278 s	.65 (b)
.279	.66
.282-283 (a)	.67-68 (a)
.286	.68 (b) -69 (a)
.284-285	.69 (b) -71 (a)
.289 (b) -291 (a)	.71 (b) -73 (a)
.295-296 (a)	.74-75 (a)
.297	.75 (b) -76 (a)
.300	.76 (b) -77 (a)
.301	cf. .77 (b)
.302 (a)	.78 (a)
.303 (a)	.78 (b)
.302 (b)	.79 (a)
.303 (b) -304	.79 (b) -80
.306-307	.81-82
.271	266.1 (b) -2 (a)

* These verses are not to be found in the *Mitākṣarā*.

Yājñavalkya	*Agni*
.272(b)-273(a)	.2(b)-3(a)
.274	.3(b)-4(a)
.275(b)	.4(b)
.276	.5
.277(b)-278(a)	.7
.279	.8(b)-9(a)
.281-283	.9(b)-12(a)
.284-287	.13-16
.288(b)-289(a)	.17
.290-291	.18-19
1.292(b)	266.20(a)
3.84(b)-90	370.27(b)-33
.206-208(a)	371.29(b)-31
.209-213(a)	.32-36(a)
.213(b)-214 s	.36(b)
Viś .205*	.37(a)
.215(a)	.38(a)
.141	376.12(b)-13(a)
.143-146	.13(b)-17(a)
.148	.17(b)-18(a)
.155(b)	.18(b)
.165-169	.19(b)-24(a)
.177-180	.24(b)-28(a)
.182-183	.28(b)-30(a)
.189	.30(b)-31(a)
.184-185(a)	.31(b)-32
.186-188	.33-35
.190-197	.36-43
.205	.44(b-c)

The verses of various other *Smṛtis* borrowed by the *Agni Purāṇa* :—

(i) *Aṅgiras* quoted by *Mit.* on *Yāj.*, 3.5-6 — *Agni*, 158.6
Mit. on *Yaj.*, 3.21 — 158.64

(ii) *Āpastamba* quoted by *Mit.* on *Yāj.*, 3.258 — *Agni*, 173.42(b)

(iii) *Atri Saṁhitā* — *Agni*
118-119(a) — 175.21
128(a) — .22(a)

(iv) *Bṛhaspati*	*Agni*
4.39	157.16
.39	158.13
.35	.15
Quoted by *Vīramitrodaya* on *Yāj.*, 2.113	255.49(b)-50(a)

(v) *Devala*	*Agni*
50-51(a)	165.20
45(a)	170.30(a)
46(a)	.31(a)

(vi) *Parāśara*	*Agni*
2.3	152.4
11.31(a)-32(a)	175.25(b)-26

(vii) *Prāchetasa*	*Agni*
Quoted by *Mit.* on *Yāj.*, 3.1-2	158.50(b)

(viii) *Saṁbarta*	*Agni*
158(a)	173.52(b)

(ix) *Śaṅkha*	*Agni*
1.1-5	151.64-68
2.3	153.4
.9-12	.7-8
8.1	155.3(b)-4(a)
18.4	171.6(a)-7(b)
.8(b)-9(a)	.9
Quoted by *Vīramitrodaya* on *Yāj.*, 2.113.	255.50(b)

(x) *Vṛddha Agastya* quoted by *Mit.* on *Yāj.*,	*Agni*
3.5-6	158.40(b)-41

(xi) *Viṣṇu* quoted by *Vīramitrodaya* on *Yāj.*,	*Agni*
3.227	173.2
Quoted by *Mit.* on *Yāj.*, 3.227	.4

(xii) *Vṛddha Yājñavalkya* quoted by *Mit.* on *Yāj.*,	*Agni*
3.1-2	158.51(b)-52(a)

	Agni
(xiii) *Vṛddha Yama* quoted by *Mit.* on *Yāj.*, 3.260	173.53-54
(xiv) *Yama* quoted by *Mit.* on *Yāj.*, 3.263-264 Quoted by *Mit.*	173.15-16(a) .19(a)

Borrowings from Medical Treatises :—

(i) *Chakradatta*

Chakradatta		*Agni*
Jvarādhikāra	.104	285.3(a)
,,	.164	.3(b)
,,	.115	.5
,,	.186	.6
Hikvāśvāsādhikāra	.4	.10
Ārochakādhikāra	.11	.11
Tṛṣṇādhikāra	.13	.13
Kuṣṭhādhikāra	.124	.20(b)-21(a)
,,	.101-104	.21(b)-24
Upadaṁśādhikāra	.7	.25(b)-26(a)
Chhudrarogādhikāra	.118	.28(b)-29(a)
Masūrikādhikāra	.26	.29(b)
Visarpa-Visphoṭādhikāra	.22-23	.31-32(a)
,,	.21	.32(b)-33(a)
Vraṇaśothādhikāra	.29	.35
,,	.63	.36(a)
Nārivraṇarogādhikāra	.14	.37(b)-38-(a)
Āmavātādhikāra	.7	.41(b)-42(a)
,,	.6(a)	.42(b)
,,	.9	.43
Vātaraktādhikāra	.9	.44(b)-45(a)
,,	.11	.46
Vātavyādhirogādhikāra	.57(a)	.47(a)
Sophādhikāra	.20(b)	.51(a)
Arśarogādhikāra	.103	.52
Gaṇḍamālādhikāra	.14-15	.53(b)-54
Gulmādhikāra	.33-34(a)	.56-57(a)
Kṛmī-adhikāra	.2(c)	.59(a)
Atisārādhikāra	.67	.60
,,	.66	.61
Jvarātisārādhikāra	.27	.63
Rasāyanādhikāra	.3	.64

Chakradatta		*Agni*
Vājīkaraṇādhikāra	.4	.65(b)-66(a)
Śirarogādhikāra	.19	.71
Netrarogādhikāra	.168	.75
Virechanādhikāra	.1	.77(a)
Bālarogādhikāra	.21	283.1
„	.27	.2
Galagaṇḍādhikāra	.27 s	.12

(ii) *Charakasaṁhitā*

Charakasaṁhitā		*Agni*
Chikitsāsthāna	21.99-100	285.8-9
„	14.45	.18
„	15.22	.19

(iii) *Suśrutasaṁhitā*

Suśrutasaṁhitā		*Agni*
Kalpasthāna	4.22(a)	294.5(b)

(iv) *Vāgabhaṭṭa*

Vāgabhaṭṭa		*Agni*
Chikitsāsthāna	1.52(a)	285.2(a)
Uttarasthāna	36.5(a)	294.5(a)
„	.4(b)	.5(b)
„	.5(b)	.6(a)

(v) *Vṛndamādhava*

Vṛndamādhava	*Agni*
1.88(a)	285.2(a)
.119(a)	.3(a)
.120	.5
.188	.6
12.3	.10
14.11	.11
17.17	.13
18.6	.17
51.79-82(a)	.21(b)-24
50.7	.25(b)-26(a)
1.134(a)	.39(a)
74.1	.75(b)-76(a)
.15	.76(b)-77(a)

Verses on Sanskrit Poetics borrowed by the *Agni Purāṇa* from older texts :—

(i) *Kāvyādarśa of* Daṇḍin	*Agni*
1.10(b)	337.6(b)
.11(a)	.8(b)
.29(a)	.13(b)
.11(b)	.21(a)
.12(b)	.23(a)
.14(a)	.24(b)
.15(a)	.25(b)
.17(b)	.26(a)
.16	.29(b)-30(a)
2.66(a)	344.23(a)
.221	.24(b)-25(a)
.323	.26(b)-27(a)
.199	.27(b)-28(a)
1.93	345.13
2.304(a)	.18(a)

(ii) *Kāvyālaṁkāra of* Bhāmaha	*Agni*
2.21	344.22
.68(a)	345.15(b)
3.29(a)	.16(b)
.8(a)	.18(b)
.79	.17

(iii) *Dhvanyāloka of* Ānandavardhana	*Agni*
p. 382	339.10-11

(iv) *Nāṭyaśāstra of* Bharata	*Agni*
6.40	339.7(b)-8(a)
.16	.8(b)-9(a)
.37(a)	.12(a)
24.3	.37(b)-38(a)
22.31-32	.47-48
.51(b)-54	.51-52
8.3	341.2
9.4-9	.13(b)-19(a)
16.63-64	343.15-17

(v) *Śṛṅgāratilaka of* Rudrabhaṭṭa	*Agni*
1.9	339.8-9(a)
.6(b)	.9(b)
.28(a)	.38(b) . .
.40(a)	.39(a)
.46	.41
.19	cf. 340.5

(vi) *Tantravārttika,* p. 318	*Agni,*	345.11(a)
(vii) Bhartṛmitra quoted by Mukula (*Abhidhāvṛttimātṛkā,* p. 17)	*Agni,*	345.11(b)

Verses borrowed from the *Amarakośa* :—

Amar.	*Agni*
I. 1.11	360.2
.35(a)	.5(b)
.46	.8
.52(a)	.10(b)
.56(b)-57(a)	.12(b)-13(a)
.65-67(a)	.16(b)-18
.71(a)	.19(b)
I. 2.6(b)	.21(a)
.9(b)-10(a)	.22(b)-23(a)
.12-13	.24-25
.15(a)	.26(a)
.17(a)	.27(b)
.22(a)	.29(b)
.28(a)	.31(a)
.33(b)-36(a)	.32-34
I. 3.2(b)	.36(a)
.3(b)	.36(b)
.5(b)	.37(b)
.7-9(a)	.38(b)-40(a)
.22(b)	.41(a)
.23(b)-25(a)	.41(b)-44(a)
.28(a)	.44(b)
.28(b)	.45(b)
.29(a)	.45(a)
.31(b)	.46(a)
I. 4.1-2(a)	.46(b)-47
.5(b)-7(a)	.49(b)-51(a)
.10(a)	.51(b)
.12(b)-17(a)	.52(b)-57(a)
I. 5.2(b)	.58(b)
.15(b)-17(a)	.63(b)-65(a)
.20(a)	.66(b)
.25(b)-26(a)	.67(b)-68(a)
I. 6.1(b)-2(a)	.70
.3(b)-6	.71-74(b)
.11(a)	.76(a)
.17(b)-23	.77-82(a)
.23(b)	.82(b)
.32-33	.83(b)-85(a)
.35(b)	.85(b)

Amar.	*Agni*
I. 9.3(b)	.88(a)
.10(a)	.90(a)
.11(b)	.90(b)
.43(b)	.94(a)
II. 3.7	.94(b)-95(a)
III. 3.239(b)	361.1(a)
.240-257	.1(b)-18
III. 4.1-2(a)	.19-20(a)
.5(b)-23(a)	.21-38
III. 3.2	362.1
.5	.2(b)-3(a)
.10(a)	.3(b)
.22	.4(b)-5(a)
.36(a)	.6(b)
.38(b)	.7(a)
.41(a)	.7(b)
.46(b)-47(a)	.9(b)-10(a)
.53(b)-54(a)	.11(b)-12(a)
.77(a)	.13(b)
.82	.14
.86	.15
.92-93	.16-17
.94(b)	.18(a)
.100(a)	.19(b)
.102(a)	.19(a)
.109(b)	.22(a)
.120	.23
.122	.26
.123(b)	.27(a)
.125(b)	.27(b)
.129(a)	.28(b)
.143(b)	.30(b)
.147(b)	.31(a)
.149(a)	.31(b)
.171(b)	.33(a)
.172(a)	.33(b)
.174(b)	.34(a)
.192(a)	.35(a)
.193(a)	.35(b)
.212(a)	.36(b)
.220(b)	.37(a)
.221(b)	.37(b)
.222(a)	.38(a)
.227(a)	.39(b)
II. 1.5(a)	363.2(a)
.16	.3
II. 2.1-4(a)	.4-7(a)
.6-7(a)	.7(b)-8(a)

Amar.	*Agni*
.10(a)	.9(a)
.16	.9(b)-10(a)
.18(a)	.10(b)
.19(a)	.11(a)
II. 4.2(a)	.12(a)
.3(b)-4(a)	.12(b)-13(a)
.6	.13(b)-14(a)
.21(b)	.16(a)
.25(b)	.18(b)
.26(a)	.19(a)
.27	.19(b)-20(a)
.31	.21
.33(a)	.22(a)
.35(a)	.22(b)
.38(a)	.23(a)
.43(a)	.25(a)
.48(a)	.27(a)
.50	.28(b)-29(a)
.57	.31(b)-32(a)
.74(b)	.37(a)
.79(b)	.39(b)
.84(b)	.42(a)
.92(b)	.45(b)
.98(b)	.48(b)
.103	.50(b)
.110	.53(b)-54(a)
.112(b)	.54(b)
.123	.58
.132(a)	.60(a)
.137(b)	.61(b)
.139(b)	.62(a)
.141(b)	.63(b)
.149(a)	.65(b)
.152(b)	.66(b)
.153(a)	.67(a)
.167(b)	.70(b)
II. 5.30(b)	.75(b)
.37(b)	.76(b)
II. 6.10(a)	364.2(a)
.34	.5
.38	.6
.48(a)	.9(a)
.52(b)	.9(b)
.52-53(a)	.10-11(a)
.54(b)	.11(b)
.55(a)	.12(a)
.64(b)	.13(a)
.65(a)	.13(b)

Amar	*Agni*
.66	.14(b)-15(a)
.68(b)-69	.15(b)-16
.74-76(a)	.17(b)-19(a)
.77	.20
.78(b)	.21(a)
.83-84	.21(b)-23(a)
.88(b)	.24(a)
.90(b)	.24(b)
.94(a)	.25(a)
.102(b)	.26(b)
.114(b)	.28(a)
.137(a)	.29(a)
.139(a)	.29(b)
II. 7.7(b)	365.1(b)
.17(a)	.3(b)
.23(a)	.4(b)
.24(a)	.5(a)
.25(a)	.5(b)
.26(a)	.6(a)
.34(c)	.6(b)
.35(a)	.7(a)
.37(b)	.7(b)
.40(a)	.8(a)
.40(b)	.9(a)
.41(b)	.9(b)
.43	.10
.49-50(a)	.11
II. 8.1(a)	366.1(a)
.2	.1(b)-2(a)
.5(b)	.3(a)
.8-10(a)	.4-6(a)
.31(a)	.7(b)
.33(b)	.8(a)
.60(a)	.10(a)
.65(a)	.11(a)
.66(a)	.11(b)
.81-82	.12-13
.86(a)	.15(a)
.87(b)	.15(b)
.89(b)	.16(a)
.99(a)	.19(a)
.101(a)	.19(b)
.102(a)	.20(a)
.103(a)	.20(b)
.111	.21(b)-22(a)
.117(b)	.23(a)
II. 9.24(a)	.26(a)
.26(b)	.27(a)

Amar	*Agni*
.27-28(a)	.27(b)-28
.47(b)	.31(a)
.64(a)	.31(b)
.71(a)	.33(a)
.83(b)-84	.35-36(a)
.85(b)-87(a)	.36(b)-38(a)
.88(a)	.38(b)
.90(a)	.39(a)
.97(a)	.39(b)
.99(b)	.40(b)
II. 10.5(a)	.43(a)
.11(a)	.45(a)
III. 1.3(a)	367.1(b)
.4(a)	.2(a)
.6(a)	.2(a)
.25(b)	.6(b)
.34	.8(b)-9(a)
.35(b)-36(a)	.9(b)-10(a)
.38(a)	.11(a)
.50(a)	.13(b)
.61(a)	.15(b)
.72(a)	.19(a)
.78(a)	.20(a)
III. 2.30(b)	.25(b)

In addition to the similarity between the verses of the *Amarakośa* and the *Agni Purāṇa* as noted above the *Agni Purāṇa* summarises the whole of the *Amarakośa* in eight chapters as such :—

Amarakośa	*Agni Purāṇa*
I. *Svarādikāṇḍa*	
1. *svargavarga*	360.1(a)-20(a)
2. *vyomādivarga*	360.20(b)-35(a)
3. *kālavarga*	360.35(b)-46(a)
4. *dhīvarga*	360.46(b)-57(a)
5. *śabdādivarga*	360.57(b)-59
6. *nāṭyavarga*	360.70(a)-85
7. *pātālabhogivarga*	360.86(a)-87(b)
8. *narakavarga*	360.87(b) only in three words
9. *vārivarga*	360.88(a)-94(a)
II. *Bhūmyādivarga*	
1. *bhūmivarga*	363.1(b)-3
2. *puravarga*	363.4(a)-11(a)

Amarakośa	*Agni Purāṇa*
3. *śālivarga*	360.94(b)-95(a) and 363.11(b) only in three words
4. *vanauṣadhivarga*	363.11(b)-71(a)
5. *siṁhādivarga*	363.71(b)-78
6. *nṛvarga*	364 whole chapter
7. *brahmavarga*	365 whole chapter
8. *kṣatriyavarga*	366.1-23(a)
9. *vaiśyavarga*	366.23(b)-42
10. *śūdravarga*	366.43(a)-48
III. *Sāmānyakāṇḍa*	
1. *viśeṣnighnavarga*	367.1(b)-21
2. *saṁkirṇavarga*	367.22(a)-25
3. *nānārthavarga*	361.1(a)-18(b) ; 362.1(a)-23(b) and 362.26-40
4. *avyayavarga*	361.19(a)-38.

Bhagavadgītā

Gītā	*Agni*
6.29(a)	162.6(b)
.30 s	.7(a)
2.62(a)	381.3(a)
.62-63 s	.3(b)
.69	.5(b)-6(a)
3.17(b)	.6(b)
.28	.7(b)-8(a)
4.36(b)	.8(b)
.37(b)	.9(a)
5.10	.9(b)-10(a)
6.29	.10(b)-11(a)
.41(b)	.11(b)
.40(b)	.12(a)
7.14	.12(b)-13(a)
.16(b)	.13(b)
.16(a)	.14(a)
8.3	.14(b)-15(a)
.4	.15(b)-16(a)
.5 s	.16(b)
.6 s	.17
.13(a)	.18(a)
Chapter .10 s	.18(b)
13.1 s	.20(a)
.5-17	.21-33

Gītā	*Agni*
.24-25	.34-35
14.17	.36
.25 s	.37
15.1	.38
16.6(a)	.39(a)
.1-3 s	.39(b)-40
.21	varient noted in the foot note
17.7(a)	.41(a)
.15-22 s	.45-47
.23	.48
18.12	.49
16.14	.51
17.20-23 s	.52
.24	.53

Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra

	Hayaśīrṣa	*Agni*
Ādikāṇḍa	*2.1	39.1(b)
	.2	.2(a)
	.6	.5(a)
	3.3	.6(a)-7(b)
	4.2	.7(b)-8(a)
	.6	.9(a)
	5.9	.13(a)
	.13	.13(b)-14(a)
	.14	.14(b)-15(a)
	6.14	.16(a)
	.15(a)	.16(b)
	.15(b)-16(a)	.17(a)
	.16(b)	.17(b)
	.17	.18(a)
	7.2-3	.19-20
	.4	.21(a)
	.5	.21(b)
	10.14	40.24(a)
	.15	.24(b)-25(a)
	.16	.25(b)-26(a)
	.17	.26(b)
	.25	.29(b)
	.26	.30
	11.1	41.1(b)
	.3	.2(a)
	.14	.2(b)
	.20	cf. .3

Hayaśīrṣa	*Agni*
.26	.5(a)
.27-29	.5(b)-8(a)
.36	.10(a)
.38	.11
12.4	.14
.7	.16(a)
.8-10	.16(b)-19(a)
.41	.21(b)
.42-46	.22-26
.47	.27(a)
.48	.27(b)
.49	.28
.50 s	.29(a)
.53	.30(a)-31(b)
.54	.31(b)
.56	.32(a)
.58	.33(a)
.59-62	.33(b)-37
13.1-19	42.1-19(a)
.20 s	.19(b)
.21	.20(a)
.25	.21(a)
.26	.22
.37	.26
14.2	43.1(b), 2(b)
.3	.2(a)
.4	..3
15.1	.9(b)
.2	.10
.3	.11
.7	.12(a)
.25	.12(b)-13(a)
.26	.13(b)
.40	.15(b)
16.21-23 s	.18
.24-26	.19-21
.27	.22(a)
.28 s	.22(b)
.30-31	.23-24
.36-38	26
17.2	44.1
.8(a)	.2
.8(b)-23	.3-18(a)
.24	.18(b)
.25-29	.19-23
.30(a)	.24(a)
.30(b)-38	.25-33(a)
.39-49	
	.34-44

Hayaśīrṣa	*Agni*
.50	.45(a)
.51 s	.45(b)
.52 s	.46(a)
.54(a)	.46(b)
.54(b)	cf. .47(a)
.55	.47(b)
.55-57	cf. .48-49
18.1(b)-2(a)	45.1(b)
.2(b)	.2(a)
.3-7	.2(b)-7(a)
19.1(b)	.7(b)
.3-9	.8-14
22.4-8 s	48.1-2
.2	.13(a)
.2(b)-3	.14
23.4	49.4(a)
.5 s	.5(a)
.6 s	.5(b)
.7	.6
.32	.7
24.2	.10(a)-11
.12	.14
.13 s	.15(a)
.14-15 s	.15(b)
.20	.17(b)-18(a)
.21	.18(b)-19(a)
25.1 s	.19(b)
.2	.20(a)
.3 s	.20(b)
.5	.21
.6	.22(a)
.7	.22(b)-23(a)
27.8 s	50.20(b)
.9 s	.21(a)
.10(a) s	.21(b)
.10(b)	.22(a)
.13-21	.23-28
31.1-22	53.1-23
32.1-3(a)	55.1-3(a)
.3(b)-4 s	.3(b)
.5-10	.4-9
33.1-2 s	56.1
.3	.2(a)
34.2	.2(b)
.7	.3
.26	.9(b)-10(a)
.27(b)	.10(b)
.28	.11

Hayaśīrṣa	*Agni*
.31	.12
.32	.13
.33	.14(a)
.1 (of *mantra* portion)	versified in vv. 17-19
.2-10	.22-32
Paṭalas 35 and 36	chapts. 57 and 58
37.1 s	59.1(a)
.2-5	.1(b)-5(a)
.6	.5(b)
.9(a)	.6(b)
.16	.9(b)
.17-35	.10-28(a)
.38-39(a)	.29(a)-30
.55(b)-57(a)	.37-39
.58	.40(a)
.38 s	60.1-5
39.1-3	.6-8
.4	.9(a)
.5-7 s	.9(b)-11(a)
.8	.11(b)-12(a)
.9	.13
.17	.14
.18 s	.15(a)
.23 s	.15(b)
.25-26	.16-18(a)
.27 s	.18(b)
.28	.19
.30	23(b)
.33	.24
.34	.25(a)
.35-36	.25(b)-27(a)
.37(a)	.27(b)
Other verses of this paṭala summarised	
40.5	.28 to the end of of the chapter*
paṭala 41 s	61.1
42.5 s	.2
.6	.3(a)
.7	.3(b)
.10	.4(a)
.11	.5
43.1	.6(a)
.2	.7(b)
.3	.8
	.9(a)

---

* Some verses of this *paṭala* are not numbered, though we have many verses common to the two texts.

Hayaśirṣa	*Agni*
.6	.10(b)
.7	.11
.9	.12(a)
.12-14	.13-15
.15	.16(a)
44.1-6 s	.16(b)
.7	.17
8	.18(a)
.9	.18(b)
.11-18	.19-26
.19	.27(b)
.20 s	.28
.21	.29(a)
.22	.29(b)
.24(a)	.30(a)
.24(b)-25 s	.30(b)
.26	.31(a)
.27-28	.31(b)-32
.30-31 s	.33
.32	.34(a)
.33	cf. .34(b)
.34-41(a)	.35-42(a)
.41(b)-42 s	.42(b)
.43	.43(b)-44(a)
.44-45 s	.44(b)
.49	.45(b)
.51	.46
.52	.47(a)
.49	.47(b)
.50	.48
.52-53 s	.49(a)
.56(a)	.49(b)
.56(b)-57 s	.50

Saṁkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa

(i) *Śrisaṁsthāna Paṭala*
fol. 56-57

(ii) *Vihagendrasthāna Paṭala*
fol. 57-58(a)

(iii) *Chakrapratiṣṭhā Paṭala*
fol. 58(a)-58(b)

(iv) *Viśeṣapratiṣṭhā Paṭala*
fol. 58(b)-59(b)

(v) *Chaturmukhasthāpana Paṭala*
fol. 59(b)-61(a)

Paṭalas 7-30 are summarised in chapts.
63.7(b)-12

Hayaśīrṣa	*Agni*
(vi) *Narasiṁhapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 61(a)-63(a)	
(vii) *Varāhapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 63(a)-65(a)	
(viii) *Puruṣottamasthāpana Paṭala* fol. 65(a)-67(a)	
(ix) *Vāmanapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 67(b) of the photostat copy of the MS	
(x) *Vaiṅgalyapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 67(b)-69(a)	
(xi) *Hayaśīrṣapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 69(a)-69(b)	
(xii) *Aniruddhapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 69(b)-70(b)	
(xiii) *Jalāśayapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 70(b)-71(b)	
(xiv) *Daśāvatārapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 71(b)-72(b)	
(xv) *Anantapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 72(b)-74(a)	
(xvi) *Viśvarūpapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 74(a)-75(b)	
(xvii) *Liṅgasthāpana Paṭala* fol. 75(b)-76(b)	
(xviii) *Rūdrapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 76(b)-77(b)	
(xix) *Ardhanārīśvarapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 77(b)-78(a)	
(xx) *Hariśaṁkarasthāpana Paṭala* fol. 78(a)-79(a)	
(xxi) *Mātṛkāsthāpana Paṭala* fol. 79(a)-79(b)	
(xxii) *Bhairavasthāpana Paṭala* fol 79(b)-81(a)	
(xxiii) *Ādityapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 81(a)-82(b)	
(xxiv) *Gaṇapatisthāpana Paṭala* fol. 82(b)-83(a)	

Hayaśirṣa	*Agni*
(xxv) *Gauristhāpana Paṭala* fol. 83(a)-84(a)	
(xxvi) *Grahalokapālasthāpana Paṭala* fol. 84(a)-85(a)	
(xxvii) (*A*)*chalapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 85(b)-88(a)	
(xxviii) *Chalaliṅgapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 88(b)-92(b)	
(xxix) *Lepārchāpratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 92(b)-94(a)	
(xxx) *Chitrapaṭalapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 94(a)-94(b)	
(xxxi) *Vidyāpratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 94(b)-97(a)	63.13-26
(xxxii) *Kūpavāpitarāgapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 97(a)-101(a)	Chapter 64
(xxxiii) *Sabhāpratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 101(a)-103(b)	Chapter 65
(xxxiv) *Samudāyapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 103(b)-105(b)	Chapter 66
(xxxv) *Jirṇoddhārapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 105(b)-107(a)	Chapter 67
(xxxvi) *Utsavapratiṣṭhā Paṭala* fol. 107(a)-110(a)	Chapter 68
(xxxvii) *Snapana Paṭala* fol. 110(b)-114(a)	Chapter 69.1-23(a)
(xxxviii) *Śrīvivāha Paṭala* fol. 114(a)-118(b)	
(xxxix) *Gaurīvivāha Paṭala* fol. 118(b)-121	69.23(b)

Kāmandaka Nītisāra (TSS, Ed.)

Kāmandaka	*Agni*
1.20	238.2
.21(b)-22(a)	.3
.23-24	.4-5

Kāmandaka	*Agni*
.27	.6
.57	.7
2.2	.8
.7	.9
.32	.10
3.1(b)-2	.11-12(a)
.9	.12(b)-13(a)
.7	.13(b)-14(a)
.21	.14(b)-15(a)
.26(a)	.15(b)
.31(a)	.16(b)
.32(a)	.17(b)
.32(b)	.18(a)
.33-37*	.18(b)-23(a)
4.1	239.1
.6-7	.2(b)-4(a)
.8	.4(b)-5(a)
.10	.5(b)-6(a)
.14-18	.6(b)-11(a)
.24	.11(b)-12(a)
.27-38(a)	.12(b)-23
.49-50	.24-25
.52(a)	.26(a)
.53-54(a)	.26(b)-27
.55-56	.28-29
.60(b) first half	.
.61(a) second half	.30(a)
.61(b)	.30(b)
.63-66	.31-34
.69-70(a)	.35-36(a)
.71	.36(b)-37(a)
.72 s	.37(b)
5.15	.38(b)-39(a)
.17(b)-18	.39(b)-40
.31(a)	.41(a)
.47(b)	.41(b)
.51	.42
.60(a)	.43(a)
.74(a)	.44(a)
.77-78(a)	.44(b)-45
.81	.46
6.2(a)	.47(b)
Sarga .7 s	.48
8.16-19	240.1(b)-5(a)
9.2-4(a)	.6(b)

* *Agni*, 238.19(a) completely tallies with Bombay Ed. 3.33(b) but not with TSS text.

Kāmandaka	*Agni*
.21	.9
.24-28(a)	.10-14(a)
10.1(b)-5	.14(b)-18
.16	.19
.19(b)-24(a)	.20-24
11.2	.26(b)-27(a)
.12(b)	.28(a)
.23	.28(b)-29(a)
.24(b)-25	29(b)-30
.27-28	.31-32
12.7	241.1
.4(a)	.2(a)
.12(a)	.2(b)
.30	.3
.36	.4
.42	.5
.46	.6
13.2-3	.7-8
.6	.9
.7(b)	.10(a)
.8(b)	.10(b)
.12(b)	.11(a)
.14(b)	.11(b)
.33(a)	.12(a)
.36(a)	.12(b)
14.18(a)	.13(b)
.19(a)	.14(a)
.20-21	.14(b)-16(a)
.23-24	.16(b)-18(a)
.26	.18(b)-19(a)
.28-29(a)	.19(b)-20
.31(b) first half	
.32(a) second half	.21(b)
.33(a)	.22(b)
.35	.23
.38(a)	.24(a)
.61-62	.25(b)-27(a)
.63-64 s	.27(b)
.65-69(a)	.28-32(a)
.71-72(a)	32(b)-33
.92	.34
15.7	.35
.9(a)	.36(a)
.13(a)	.36(b)
.14	.37
.18	.38(b)-39(a)
.56-58(a)	.41(a)
17.1(b)	.42(a)

Kāmandaka	*Agni*
.5 s	.42(b)
.6	.43
.11-12(a)	.44-45(a)
.14(a)	.45(b)
18.3	.46
.6-9(a)	.48(b)-51
.10 s	.52(a)
.11(a)	.52(b)
.12(a)	.53(a)
.15	.54
.33(b)	.55(a)
.35(b)	.56(a)
.36(a)-37(b) s	.56(b)
.37(b) second half	
.38(a) first half	.57(a)
.39(b)-40	.58-59(a)
.42(b)	.59(b)
.43(b) second half	.60(a) second half
.46(b)	.60(b)
.47(a)	.61(a)
.53-54(a)	.63-64(a)
.55-56(a)	.64(b)-65(a)
.57(a)	.65(b)
.57(b)	.66(a)
.59(b)-61(b)	.66(b)-68
19.2(b)	242.1(a)
.3	.1(b)-2(a)
.24(b)	.2(b)
.44-52	.3-11
.53(b)	.12(a)
.54-62	.12(b)-21(a)
.64(b)-65	.21(b)-22
.66(b)	.23(a)
20.1(a)	.23(b)
.2(b)	.24(a)
.3 s	.24(b)
.4(b)-6	.25-27(a)
.7 s	.27(b)
.10-11	.28-29
.12-13	cf. .30(a)
.14	.30(b)-31(a)
TSS p. 298.	
1.3-4	.31(b)-32(a)
.7	.32(b)
Bom. Ed. 19.15(a)	.33(a)
20.16(b)	.33(b)
.17(b)	.34(a)
.18-21 s	.34(b)-35(a)

Kāmandaka	*Agni*
.24-31	.35(b)-41(a)
.33(b)	.44(a)
.35(b)	.45(a)
.37-39	.45(b)-48(a)
.40(b)	.48(b)
.41(a)	.49(a)
.42-47	.49(b)-55(a)
.48-52(a)	.55(b)-59
.53(a)	.60(a)
.55-58	.61-64

Miscellaneous Sources

Aśvavaidyakaṁ of Jayadatta	*Agni*
7.63(a)-71(a)	287.12(b)-20(a)

Gorakṣapaddhati	*Agni*
I. .47	cf. 214.1
.26	cf. .2
.27(a)-28(a)	.3(b)-4(b)
.33	.5(b)-6(a)
.36	.13
.44	.26

Rāmāyaṇa :	*Agni*
Bālakāṇḍa	Chapter 5
Ayodhyākāṇḍa	„ 6
Araṇyakāṇḍa	„ 7
Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa	„ 8
Sundarkāṇḍa	„ 9
Yuddhakāṇḍa	„ 10
Uttarakāṇḍa	„ 11

Mahābhārata	*Agni*, Chapters 13, 14, and 15.

Upaniṣadas	*Agni*
(1) *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*, I. 4.10.	377.23(b) : *ahaṁ brahmā, etc.*
(2) *Chhāndogyaupaniṣad*, 8.16.	377.23(a) : *tatvamasīti.*
(3) *Māṇdukyaupaniṣad* 2, and *Bṛhadānaṇyakopaniṣad*, II. 5.19.	377.1 : *ayamātma paraṁ brahma.*
(4) *Īśāvāśyopaniṣad*. 1.	216.14(a) *Īśāvāśyamidaṁ sarvaṁ.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ORIGINAL SOURCES

Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi	Ed. R. Shamasastry, Mysore, 1926.
Agni Purāṇa	Ed. Hari Narain Apte, ĀSS, Poona 1900. Ed. R. Mitra, Bib. Ind. Calcutta, 1873-79. Eng. Tr. M. N. Dutt, Vols. I-II, Calcutta, 1903-1904.
Amarakośa (*Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*) with the commentary of Kṣīrasvāmī	Ed. H. D. Sharma and N. G. Sardesai, Poona, 1941.
Anargharāghava of Murārimiśa	With Hindi Tr. Ram Chandra Mishra, Varanasi, 1960.
Anekārthadhvanimañjarī, with *Dvirūpakośa* and *Ekākṣarākośa*	Banaras, 1960.
Aśvavaidyakam of Jayadatta and *Aśvachikitsitam* of Nakula	Ed. Jīvananda Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta, 1893.
Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya of Vāgabhaṭa	With Hindi Tr. Venkatesvara Press, Bombay, 1890.
*Atri Smṛti**	
Bārhaspatyasūtra	Ed. F. W. Thomas, Lahore, 1921.
Baudhāyana-gṛha-śeṣasūtra	Ed. R. Shamasastry, Mysore. University Oriental Library, 1920.
Brahma Purāṇa	Ed. ĀSS, Poona, 1895.
Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa	Published by Venkatesvara Press. Bombay, 1923.
Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa	Gurumaṇḍala Granthamālā Series, Calcutta, 1955.
Bṛhaddharma Purāṇa	Ed. Hara Prasad Ṣāstrī, Bib. Ind., 1897.
Bṛhaspati Smṛti	Reconstructed and Ed. K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, GOS, Baroda, 1941.
*Bṛhatparāśara Smṛti**	
Bṛhatsaṁhitā	With commentary, Bhattotapala, Part I-II, V.E. 1952 and 1954.
Buddhabhuṣaṇa	Ed. H. D. Velankar, BORI, 1926.
Charakaśaṁhitā	With Hindi tr. Venkateswar Press, Vols. I-II V.E. 1958,

Colebrooke's Digest	
Çṛṅgāratilaka	Ed. R. Pischel, Kiel, 1886.
Dānasāgara	Ed. Bhabatosh Bhattacharya, Bib. Ind., Calcutta, 1956.
Daṇḍaviveka of *Vardhamāna*	GOS., Baroda, 1931.
Daśakumāracharita	Bombay Sanskrit Series.
Dhvanyāloka	With Hindi Tr., Badrinath Jha, Banaras, 1953.
Divyatattva of Raghunandana	Ed. Jivānanda Vidyasāgara.
Garuḍa Purāṇa	Venkateswar Press, V.E. 1963. Eng. Tr. M. N. Dutt, Calcutta, 1908.
Gautama Dharmasūtra	Ed. Hari Narain Apte, ĀSS, Poona, 1910.
Gheraṇḍasaṁhitā	Venkateswar Press, V.E. 2013.
Gorakṣapaddhati	Venkateswar Press, Bombay, V.E. 2011.
Harivaṁśa Purāṇa	Ed. R. Kinjawadekar, Poona, 1936.
Hastyāyurveda	ĀSS. Poona, 1894.
Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra	
Ādikāṇḍa, Vol. I, *Paṭalas* 1-14	Varendra Research Society, Rajashahi, 1952.
Paṭalas 15—the end	1956.
	Photo Stat copy, Ms. cat. no. 4200 ? Asiatic Society, Calcutta.
Kathāsaritsāgara	With Hindi Tr., Kedar Nath Sharma Saraswat, Patna, 1960.
Kādambarī	Ed. Kaśīnāth Paṇḍuraṅg Parab, Ninth Edition, NSP, 1948.
Kālikā Purāṇa	Venkateswar Press, Bombay, S.E. 1829.
Kāmandakīya Nītisāra	Venkateswar Press, Bombay, V.E. 2009.
Kāmandaka Nītisāra	Ed. T. Gaṇapati Sāstrī, TSS, Trivandrum, 1912.
Kāmasūtra of *Vātsyāyana*	Vols. I-II, Venkateswar Press, Bombay, 1856.
Karpūramañjarī	Ed. Sten Konow with Eng. Tr. and notes by C. R. Lanman, HOS, 1901.
Kauṭilya'a *Arthaśāstra*	Eng. Tr. R. Shamasastry, Fifth Edition, Mysore, 1956. With Hindi Tr. Ganga Prasad Sastri, Second Edition, Gupta Press, Ṣamatī, Dt. Muzaffarnagar, V.E. 2010.

*Kātyāyana Smṛti**	
Kāvyalaṁkārasūtra of Vāmana	Ed. Durga Prasad and Kāśīnāth Paṇḍurang Parab, Third Edition, NSP, Bombay, 1926.
Kāvyādarśa of *Daṇḍī*	With commentary and Hindi Tr. Ram Chandra Mishra, Varanasi, 1958.
Kāvyālaṁkāra of Bhāmaha	With Hindi commentary. Devendra Nath Sharma, Patna, 1962.
Kāvyamīmāṁsā	Ed. Kedar Nath Sharma Saraswat, Patna, 1954.
Kirātārjunīya of *Bhāravi*	NSP, 1907.
Kṛtyaratnākara of Chaṇḍeśvara	Bib. Ind. Calcutta, 1925.
Kumārapālapratibodha of Somaprabha	Ed. Jinavijaya Muni, GOS, 1920.
Lalitavistara	Bib. Ind. Calcutta, 1882.
Markaṇḍeya Purāṇa	Ed. K. M. Banerjea, Bib. Ind. Calcutta, 1962.
Madanapārijāta	Ed. Madhusūdana Smṛtitīrtha, Bib. Ind. Calcutta, 1893.
Manu Smṛti	With the commentary of Kullūkabhaṭṭa, Gujarati Printing Press, Bombay, 1913.
Matsya Purāṇa	Gurumaṇḍala Granthamālā, Calcutta, 1954.
Mayūkhas, Twelve *mayūkhas* of Nīlakaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa :—	
Saṁskāra Mayūkha	Gujarati Printing Press, 1913.
Āchāra Mayūkha	,, ,, ,, 1915.
Samaya Mayūkha	,, ,, ,,
Śrāddha Mayūkha	,, ,, ,,
Nītimayūkha	,, ,, ,, 1921.
Vyavahāra Mayūkha	,, ,, ,, 1923.
Dāna Mayūkha	Banaras, 1909.
Utsarga Mayūkha	
Pratiṣṭhā Mayūkha	
Prāyaśchita Mayūkha	Gujarati Printing Press, 1940.
Śuddhi Mayūkha	,, ,, ,, 1941.
Śānti Mayūkha	Banaras, 1943.
Mṛchchhakaṭika	Haridasa Sanskrit Series, Banaras, 1954.

Mahābhārata	With the commentary of Nilakaṇṭha, ed. R. Kinjawadekar, Poona, 1929-1933. Critical edition, Poona.
Mudrārākṣasa of Viśākhadatta	Ed. K. T. Telang, Eighth Edition, Bombay Sanskrit Series, Bombay, 1935.
Naiṣadhīyacharita	With Hindi Tr. Chandrika Prasad Sukla, Dehradun, 1951.
Nārada Smṛti	Ed. J. Jolly, Callcutta, 1885. Eng. Tr. J. Jolly, Oxford, 1889.
Narapatijayacharyāsvarodaya of Narapati	With the Commentary of Harivaṁśakavi, Venkateswar Press, Bombay, 1956.
Nāṭyaśāstra	K. M. Series, Bombay, 1943.
Nītiprakāśikā of Vaiśampāyana with *Tattvavivṛti* of Sītārāma	Government Press, Madras, 1953.
Nītivākyāmṛta	Grantharatnamālā, Bombay, 1890. Manikchandra Digambara Jain Granthamālā, Ed. Pannalal Soni, Bombay, V.E. 1979.
Padma Purāṇa	Ed. V. N. Mandlik, ĀSS. 4 Vols. Poona, 1893.
Pañcharātra of Bhāsa	Ed. and Tr. Ram Chandra Mishra, Varanasi, 1958.
Pañchatantra	Ed. and Tr. Saryu Prasad Pandey, Banaras, V.E. 1995.
Parāśaramādhavīya	Bombay Sanskrit Series, Bombay.
*Parāśara Smṛti**	
Pātañjalayogadarśana	Fifth Edition. Gorakhpur, V.E. 1017.
Prabandhachintāmaṇi of Merutuṅgāchārya	C. H. Tawney, Calcutta, 1899.
Raghuvaṁśa	
Rājadharmakaustubha	
Rājadharmakāṇḍa of *Kṛtyakalpataru*	Ed. K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, GOS, Baroda, 1943.
Rājanītikāmadhenu	
Rājataraṅgiṇī	Eng. Tr. M. A. Stein, London, 1900.
Rājanīti-Ratnākara of Chaṇḍeśvara	Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Second Edition, Patna, 1936.
Rāmacharita of Sandhyākara Nandī	Ed. Ramasvami Sastri, GOS, Baroda, 1930.
Rāmāyaṇa	Ed. G. Gorresio. Turin, 1843-67.

Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha	With Hindi Tr. Satyavrata Singh, Varanasi, 1957.
Ṣāraṅgadharapaddhati	Ed. Peter Peterson, Bombay Sanskrit Series, Bombay, 1838.
Ṣiśupālavadha of Māgha	Vidyā Bhawan Series, Banaras, 1955.
Ṣivasaṁhitā	Venkateswar Press, Bombay, 1960.
Ṣukranītisāra	Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta, 1890.
*Saṁkha-Likhita Smṛti**	
Sāṁkhya Kārikā of Iśvara Krisṇa	With Eng. Tr. Henry Thomas Colebrooke, Bombay, 1924.
Sarvadarśana Saṁgraha	Ed. and Comment. Vasudeva Shastri Abhyankar, BORI, Poona, 1924.
Siddhahema of Hemachandra	
Skanda Purāṇa	Vaṅgavāsi Edition. Venkateswar Press, Bombay, 1910.
Smṛtichandrikā of Devanabhaṭṭa	4 Vols. Government of Mysore, 1914-1918.
Smṛti-Saṁdarbha	Vols. I-IV, Calcutta, 1952.
Ṣrīmadbhagavadgītā	Gītā Press, Gorakhpur.
Suśrutasaṁhitā	With the commentary of Ḍalhaṇa, NSP, Bombay, 1938.
Suśrutasaṁhitā-śārīrasthāna	Ed. and Tr. Ghanekar, Banaras, 1950.
Tantravārttika of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa	Ed. Mm. Gaṅgādhara Ṣāstrī, Banaras, 1903.
Vaṅgasena	Tr. Lālāśāligrāma Vaiśya, Venkateswar Press, Bombay, 1804.
*Vasiṣṭha Smṛti**	
Vāyu Purāṇa	Ed. Hari Narain Apte, ĀSS, Poona, 1905.
Viddhaśālabhañjikā of Rājaśekhara	Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara, Second Edition, Calcutta, 1883.
Vīramitrodaya :—	
Āhnikaprakāśa	Chowkhambha Sanskrit Series, Banaras.
Pujāprakāśa	
Lakṣaṇaprakāśa	
Rājanītiprakāśa	
Tīrthaprakāśa	
Ṣrāddhaprakāśa	
Samayaprakāśa	
Bhaktiprakāśa	
Ṣuddhiprakāśa	
Paribhāṣāprakāśa	
Saṁskāraprakāśa	
Vyavahāraprakāśa	

Viṣṇu Purāṇa	With Hindi Tr. Gītā Press, Gorakhpur, V.E. 2014.
Viṣṇudharma	Asiatic Society, Callcutta, Ms. no. 1670.
Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa	Venkateswar Press, Bombay, 1912.
Viṣṇudharmasūtra	
*Viṣṇu Smṛti**	
*Vedavyāsa Smṛti**	
Vyavahāranirṇaya of Varadarāja	
*Vṛddhahārita Smṛti**	
Yājñavalkya Smṛti	TSS, 1922. With Vīramitrodaya and Mitākṣarā Commentaries, Banaras, 1930.
Yaśastilakachampū	Ed. with the commentary of Śrutasāgara Sūri, Vol. I, NSP, Bombay, 1916.
Yaśastilakachampūmahākāvya	Ed. Tr. Sunsarlal Sastri, Varanasi, 1960.
Yogayātrā of Varāhamihira	
Yoginītantra	Venkateswar Press, Bombay, V.E. 2013.
Yuktikalpataru of Bhoja	Ed. Īśvar Chandra Śāstrī, Calcutta, 1917.

2. MODERN WORKS

Agrawal, V. S.	*Harṣacharita : eka Sāṁskṛtika Adhyayana*, Patna, 1953.
	Kādambarī : eka Sāṁskṛtika Adhyayana, Varanasi, 1958.
Aiyangar, K. V. R.	*Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity*, Second ed. Madras University, 1935.
Altekar, A. S.	*Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their times*, Poona Oriental Book Agency, 1934.
	State and Government in Ancient India, Banaras, 1949.
Bandyopadhyaya, N. C.	*Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories*, Parts I and II, Calcutta, 1927 and 1938.
	Kauṭilya, Calcutta, 1927.
Banerjea, P. N.	*International Law and Custom in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1920.

---

* For these *smṛti* texts to the *Smṛti-Saṁdarbha*, Vols. I-IV, Calcutta.

Barnett, L. D.	*Antiquities of India,* London, 1913.
Basak, R. G.	*The History of North-Eastern India,* Calcutta, 1934.
Basham, A. L.	*The Wonder that was India,* London, 1956.
Beal, S.	*Travels of Hiouen-Thsang,* Vols. I-IV, New ed. Calcutta, 1957-1958.
Bhandarkar, D. R.	*Carmichael Lectures,* Calcutta, 1918.
	Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity, Banaras, 1929.
Bhattacharya, H. K.	*Language and Scripts of Ancient India,* Calcutta, 1959.
Bhattacharya, Tarapada	*The Cult of Brahmā,* Patna.
Bühler, G.	*Indian Paleography,* Indian Studies Past and Present, Series.
Chakravarti, P. C.	*The Art of War in Ancient India,* Dacca University, 1941.
Chatterjee, Hiralal	*International Law and Inter-State Relations in Ancient India,* Calcutta, 1958.
Choudhary, R. K.	*Select Inscriptions of Bihar,* Patna, 1958.
Dalton, Hugh	*Principles of Public Finance,* London, 1949.
Date, G. T.	*The Art of War in Ancient India,* 1929.
De, S. K.	*History of Sanskrit Poetics,* Second revised ed., Calcutta, 1960.
Dikshitar, V. R. R.	*Purāṇa—Index,* Vol. I, Madras University, 1951.
	The Gupta Polity, Madras University, 1952.
	Hindu Administrative Institutions, Madras University, 1929.
	The Matsya Purāṇa—A Study, Madras University, 1935.
	War in Ancient India, Macmillan and Co., 1944.
Elliot and Dowson	*Early Arab Geographers,* Second ed., Calcutta, 1956.
	History of India as told by its own Historians, London, 1866-77.
Farquhar, J. N.	*An Outline of the Religious Literature of India,* Oxford, 1920.
Fleet	*Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum,* Vol. III London, 1888.
Ganguly, D. C.	*History of the Paramāra Dynasty,* Dacca, 1933.

Ghoshal, U. N.	*A History of Hindu Public Life,* Calcutta, 1945. *A History of Indian Political Ideas,* Oxford, 1959. *Contributions to the History of the Hindu Revenue System,* Calcutta University, 1929. *Hindu Political Theories,* Calcutta, 1923.
Gyani, S. D.	*Studies in the Agni Purāṇa,* Banaras, 1964.
Handiqui, K. K.	*Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture,* Jain Saṁskṛti Saṁrakṣaka Saṁgha, Sholapur, 1949.
Hazra, R. C.	*Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs,* Dacca, 1940. *Studies in the Upapurāṇas,* Vol. I, Calcutta, 1958.
Heesterman, J. C.	*The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration,* Hague, 1957.
Hicks, Ursula K,	*Public Finance,* Cambridge, 1961.
Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf	*Medincine of Ancient India,* Part I (osteology), Oxford, 1907.
Jayaswal, K. P.	*Hindu Polity,* Bangalore, 1943. *Manu and Yājñavalkya,* Calcutta, 1930.
Jolly, J.	*Hindu Law and Customs,* Calcutta, 1928. *Indian Medicine,* Poona, 1951.
Kane, P. V.	*History of Dharmaśāstra,* Vols. I-V. BORI, Poona, 1930 *History of Sanskrit Poetics,* Bombay, 1951.
Kieth, A. B.	*The Sanskrit Drama in its Origin, Development, Theory and Practice,* Oxford, 1924. *A History of Sanskrit Literature,* Oxford, 1928.
Kosambi, D. D.	An *Introduction to the Study of Indian History,* Bombay 1956.
Law, N. N.	*Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity,* Oxford, 1921. *Inter-State Relations in Ancient India,* Calcutta.
Mac Crindle	*Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arian,* Calcutta, 1905.
Majundar, A. K.	*Chaulukyas of Gujarat,* Bombay, 1956.

Majumdar, B. K.	*The Military System in Ancient India,* Calcutta, 1955.
Majumdar, R. C.	*History of Bengal,* Vol. I, ed. R. C. Majumdar, Dacca, 1943. *The Classical Age,* Bombay, 1954. *The Age of Imperial Kanauja,* Bombay, 1955. *Corporate Life in Ancient India,* Calcutta, 1918.
Majumdar and Altekar	*The Vākāṭaka-Gupta Age,* Lahore, 1946.
Mirashi, V. V.	*Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum,* Vol. IV.
Mookerjee, R. K.	*Aśoka,* Delhi, 1955. *Chandragupta Maurya and his times,* Second ed.
Mukhopadhyaya, G.	*The Surgical Instruments of the Hindus,* Vol. I and II, Calcutta, 1913-14.
Munshi, K. M.	*Glory that was Gūrjara Deśa,* Vol. I and II Bombay, 1955. *Indian Inheritance,* Vols. I-III, Bhārtīya Vidyā Bhavan, 1957.
Niyogi, Roma	*History of the Gāhaḍavāla Dynasty,* Calcutta, 1959. *Bhārtīya Prāchīna Lipimālā,* Second ed., 1918.
Oppert, Gustav	*On the Weapons, Army Organisation and Political Maxims of the Ancient Hindus,* Madras, 1880.
Pandey, Rajavali	*Indian Palaeography,* Part I, Banaras, 1952.
Pandey, Ramdin	*Prāchīna Bhārata kī Sāṁgrāmiktā,* Bihar Rāṣṭrabhāṣā Pariṣad, Patna, 1957.
Pandey Veenapani	*Harivaṁsa Purāṇa kā Sāṁskṛtika Vivechana,* Prakāśana Ṣākhā, Sūchanā Vibhāga, Uttar Pradesh, 1960.
Pargiter, F. E.	*Ancient India Historical Tradition,* Oxford, 1922. *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age,* Oxford, 1913.
Patil, D. R.	*Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa,* Poona, 1946.
Praśad, Beni	*The Theory of Government in Ancient India,* Allahabad, 1927. *The State in Ancient India,* Allahabad, 1928.

Puri, B. N. *The History of the Gurjara-Pratihāras*, Bombay, 1957.

Pusalker, A. D. *Studies in Epics and Purāṇas of India*, Bombay, 1955.

Raghavan, V. *New Catalagorus Catalogorum*, Madras.

Rapson, E. J. *The Cambridge History of India*. Vol. I, Cambridge, 1922.

Ray, H. C. *The Dynastic History of Northern India*, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1931, 1936.

Sachan, E. C. *Alberuni's India*, Vol. I and II, London, 1910.

Sankaran, A. *Some Aspects of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit* or *The Theories of Rasa and Dhvanī*, Madras, 1929.

Sarkar, B. K. *Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus*, Calcutta, 1939.

Sharma, R. S. *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India*, Delhi, 1959.

Shastri, H. P. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection*, Vol. V, Calcutta, 1928.

Shastri, Jagadish Lal, *Political Thought in the Purāṇas*, Lahore, 1944.

Sinha, H. N. *Sovereignty in Ancient Indian Polity*, London, 1936.

Sircar, D. C. *Select Inscriptions Bearing on Indian History and Civilisation*, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1942.

Spaulding, Nickerson and Wright *Warfare*, Infantry Press, Washington D. C., 1937.

Tandon, Yashpal *Purāṇa Viṣaya Samanukramaṇikā*, Hoshiarpur, 1952.

Tripathi, Shree Krishnamani *Purāṇa Tattvamīmāṁsā*, Lucknow, 1961.

Verma, Ramlal, *Agni Purāṇa kā Kāvyaśāstrīya Bhāga*, Delhi, 1959.

Winternitz, M. *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. I, Calcutta University, 1927.

Woodroffe, John *Inroduction to Tantra Ṣāstra*, Ganesh & Co., Madras, Third ed. 1956.

Zimmer, Henry R. *Hindu Medicine*, Baltimore, 1948.

3. JOURNALS

Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Institue
Epigraphia Carnatica
Epigraphia Indica
Indian Antiquary
Indian Historical Quarterly
Journal of Andhra Historic Research Society, Rajahmundry
Journal of American Oriental Society
Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal
Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society
Journal of Bihar and Orissa Research Society
Journal of Bihar Research Society
Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient
Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (of Gr. Britain and Ireland)
Nāgarī Prachāriṇi Patrikā
Our Heritage, Sanskrit College, Calcutta.

4. DICTIONARIES

A Sanskrit-English Dictionary	M. Monier-Williams, Oxford, 1951
Ṣabdakalpadruma	
Sanskrit--Wörterbuch	St. Petersburg 1958
Vāchaspatyam	

INDEX

A

A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts, 2
abhidhāna, 6
abhigāmika (qualities of the king), 39
Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi, 27, 37, 41n., 44, 63, 67, 74, 83, 88, 89, 112n, 115n, 125n, 129, 140n, 157, 163n, 166n, 170n, 177, 181n, 182n, 183, 188n, 198
abhinava siddharājadeva-vola(*bāla*) *nārāyaṇāvatāra* (an epithet of the king), 33
Ābhisāras, 15
abhiṣṭa, 199
Āchāramayūkha, 10
achāṭabhaṭapraveśya, 65
adhipati (an epithet of the king), 34
adhīśvara (an epithet of the king), 34, 35, 121
āḍhya, 63
adhyakṣas, 101
adhyakṣādhikṛta, 100, 119
Ādikāṇḍa (of *Hayaśīrsa Pañcharātra*), 10, 10n
Ādiparva (of the *Mahābhārata*), 178, 178n
ādiṣṭa, 195
ādivarāha (an epithet of the king), 33
adṛṣṭanara, 195
adultery in the reverse order, 132
āgamas, 13
āgantuka (disease), 18
Agastya, 9
Aghora, 9
āgneya circle, 14
Agni, 3, 5, 6, 9, 13, 32
Āgneya Purāṇa, 204
Agni Purāṇa
  characteristics of the original, 5-6
  stages of the development of the ——, 5
  topics delt in the——, 6-7
Agrawal, Vasudeva Sharan, 2, 146
A History of Indian Political Ideas, 3
āhitāgni brāhmaṇas, 5, 6
Aihole Inscription, 124n
aiṣikāstra (a kind of weapon), 186
Ajayapāla, 59
Ajitā, 16
akara (a type of the king), 35
ākara, 199n
akhilātmajñāna, 85
ākhyāyikā, 42
ākranda, 191
ākrandāsāra, 191
akṣadarśaka (an officer), 110
akṣarakṣaka, 110
akṣepa, 20
Alberuni, 24, 64, 69, 115, 115n, 132, 153, 158, 170, 179
Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta, 45n., 155
Almanda Plates of Anantavarman, son of Rājendravarman, 96n
Al-Masudi, 164, 167, 169
Altekar, A. S., 2
Amarakośa, 34, 42, 82, 97n, 115, 142, 178
Amarasiṁha, 24
amātya (a limb of the state), 27
amātya 52, 54, 82, 97, 101, 104, 105, 106, 112
——a danger to the king and territory, 105
defects of the——, 104
executive duties of the——, 100
functions of the——, 100
financial duties of the——, 101
judicial functions of the——, 102
military duties of the——, 101
number of the——, 104
qualifications of the——, 98
amātyadharmasya, 97
Ambaḍa, 177
Ambālikā, 41
Ambaprasad (the *mahāmātya* of Jayasiṁha), 176n

Ambarnath Inscription of 782, 104n
Ambikā, 41
ambupāka, 21
Amoghavarṣa, 39n
āmuktika weapon, 63
Aṇhilavāḍa, 33
Ānandapāla (the Hindu Śāhi king), 171n
Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, 53
Ānandavardhana, 20, 25
antaḥpurādhyakṣa, 110
anantara, 190
ananvaya alaṁkāra, 8
Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, 1
Āndhra, 1, 15, 68
Anekārthadhvanimañjari (with *Dvirūpakośa*), 23n
Aṅga, 140, 175
Aṅgirā, 16
Aniruddha, 9
Añjaneri Plates of Bhogaśaki, 140, 162n
——Jayabhaṭa III, 145n
aṅkuśa, 172, 186
antaḥkopa, 93, 197
antardhi, 191n
Antarvedi, 113
anukalāstra (a type of weapon), 185
anuloma (marriage) 53
ānvīkṣikī, 38, 41, 42, 44
apahnuti, 20
aparā (knowledge), 6
Aparājitā, 16, 51
Aparārka (commentator), 36n, 39, 65, 131n
apasarases, 53
Āpastamba, 16
apradhṛṣya, 111
aprahata land, 121
aprastutapraśaṁsā, 20
Arab
——geographers, 169
——horses, 169
——merchants, 171
payment of salary among the—soldiers, 177
——soldiers, 175
——and Turkish archers, 171
ardhachakra, 23
arghakāṇḍa, 14
Arhatas, 8
ariṣaḍvarga, 36
Army
  march of the——, 181
Pāla——, 175
Rāṣṭrakūṭa——, 175
units of an——, 178-9
array
  asaṁhata——, 183
  bhoga——, 183
  chakra——, 183
  daṇḍa——, 183
  garūḍa——, 183
  madhyabhedī——, 184
  makara——, 183
  maṇḍala——, 183
  śyena——, 183
arthādhikārī, 63
arthaharaṇa, 200
arthālaṁkāra, 21
Arthaśāstra, 6, 7, 17, 27, 31, 37, 41, 42, 43, 69, 71, 74, 82, 85, 86, 91, 99, 100, 120, 126, 127, 140, 151n, 157, 161, 161n, 177, 181, 188, 198, 200, 201, 202, 205
arthaśāstra literature, 40
——tradition, 206
Arvudas, 15
Aryans, 168
Arya script, 11
aśakyapratyāvartana, 99
asāra, 191
aśeṣasāmanta (an epithet of the king), 34, 121
Asirgarh Copper Seal Inscription of Sarvavarman, 69
Aśmaka, 14
Aṣoka, 40, 54, 64n, 80
aṣṭapradhāna, 51, 84, 88
astrāchārya (an officer), 110
āśvādhyakṣa (an officer), 110
aśvapati (a title of the king), 170
aśvasādhanika, 170, 173
Aśvāyurveda of Gaṇa, 169, 171
Aśvini, 14
atathya (a kind of treaty), 196
āṭavika, 63, 110, 174
atichikkaṇa, 99
Atharvaveda, 42, 52, 107
ātmā, 195
ātmaśakti, 164

ātmasampada (qualities of the king), 39
ātmavidyā, 42
Ātreya (school of medicine), 18
Atri, 16
Atri Smṛti, 76
Avantī, 15
Ayodhyā, 15, 92
āyudhagārādhyakṣa (an officer), 110
āyuktaka, 63
āyurveda, 6, 7, 46, 118

B

badarapāka, 21n
Bāgh Cave Plate of Subandhu, 146n
Bāhlika, 15n
bahubhāṣinaḥ, 65
bāhuja, 34, 35
bāhyakopa, 93, 124
balādānam, 74, 149, 174
balādhyakṣa, 110, 119, 179
Bālāditya (a poet), 33
bālāditya (an epithet of king Narasiṁhagupta), 34
balavatpakṣa, 99
bali (a kind of tax), 149
Balhāra, 164
——king of Jurz (Juzr), 169
——king of Mānkīr, 167
Bāṇa, 15, 33, 34, 45, 57, 65, 124, 143, 173
Banagaon Copper Plate of Vigrahapāla, 103n, 175n
Banaras Plates of Karṇa, 75n, 103n
Banāyuja, 15n
bandhanapālaka (an officer), 138
bandhuvināśa, 164
bandigṛha, 200
bandin, 111
Bandyopadhyaya, N. C., 2
Banskera Plate of Harṣa, 65
Barbara, 15n
Bārhaspatya-Arthaśāstra, 100n, 106n
Bārhaspatyasūtra, 41n, 57, 192
Barnett, L.D., 14
Basahi grant of Govindachandra, 113n
Basantaka, 95
Basarh seal No. 16 and 18, 112n
battle array, 183-4
Bauddhas, 8
Baudhāyana gṛha-śeṣa-sūtra, 14
Bengal, 25
West——, 204
Bengali script, 25
betel-bearer, 114-6
——(a high officer), 114
appointment of——, 115
Betul Plates of Sankṣobha, 65n
Bhadana Plates of Sīlar Aparājita, 104n
Bhadraka, 140
bhāga, 149
bhāgahāra, 144
Bhagalpur Copper Plate of Nārāyaṇapālā, 103n, 175n
Bhagavāna, 9, 10
bhāgavatas, 10
Bhāgurāyaṇa, 84, 92n
——the (*mahāmātya*), 103
Bhākamiśra, 84, 103
Bhāmaha, 20, 24
bhāṇḍa, 96
Bharadvāja, 71
Bharata, 19, 20, 22, 24, 50, 94
Bharata, son of Daśaratha, 48
bharata (a generic term), 22
Bhārata War, 164
bhārtī rīti, 20
Bhartṛmitra, 25
Bhāsa, 161n
Bhāskara, 32
Bhattacharya, D. C., 11
——, H. D., 12
bhaṭṭāraka (an epithet of the king), 34, 35
Bhelakhi (a goddess), 16
Bherāghāṭa, 12
Bhīma, 201
Bhīmadeva, 33
Bhimaṭa II (the Kalachuri king), 170
bhindipāla (a weapon), 185
bhīṣmapañchakavrata, 9
Bhita seal No. 3, 112n
bhoga (a kind of tax), 150, 161
Bhogaśakti (the Chaulukya king), 140, 162
Bhoja, 19-22, 82, 100, 167, 169
Bhoja (country), 15
Bhoja (as an image of Nārāyaṇa), 33
bhṛṣa, 199n
bhūkti, 129
bhūmibala, 45

bhūpa (an epithet of the king), 34, 35
bhūtas, 53, 174
Bibhāvasu, 46
Bihar, 25, 204
Bilhāri Stone Inscription of Yuvarājadeva II, 124n
Bitragunta Grant of Saṁgama II, 97n
Bokkāṇa, 15n
bows and arrows, 185
Brahmā, 31, 33, 35, 46, 52
brāhma-muhūrta (definition of), 58
Brāhmaṇas, 205
Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, 160
Brahma Purāṇa, 55n, 58, 160, 197
brahmasama, 158
Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, 160
Brahmayāmala, 11, 25
Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad Bhāṣyavārtika, 8
Bṛhaddharma Purāṇa, 2, 32, 32n, 76, 77n, 88n
Bṛhannāradīya (*Purāṇa*), 2
Bṛhaspati, 14, 16, 42, 65, 106, 128, 131, 149, 153, 202
Bṛhatparāśara Smṛti, 155, 157, 159, 199
Bṛhatsaṁhitā, 14, 15n, 16, 115
British, 51
Buddhist physicians, 18
Budhabhūṣaṇa, 171, 171n
Bühler, G., 11, 11n

C

caste and military rights, 176
Ceylon, **177**
Chācha, 182
Chāchanāmā, 175
chakra (a kind of weapon), 185
Chakradatta, 19
Chakrapāṇidatta, 19
chakravartī (an epithet of the king), 34
Chakravarti, P. C., 170, 171, 176
Chakravarty, Chintaharan, 21
chamū, 179
chamūmukhya, 110
Chaṇḍaghaṇṭā, 16
Chaṇḍeśvara 39, 48, 49, 86n, 87, 106, 117, 126n, 193, 198n
Chandragomin, 22
chāndra grammar, 22
Chandra-Gupta II, 23
chāndraka, 22
Chandrāpīḍa, 33, 45, 57, 59
Chandrāvatī Copper Plate Grant of Chandradeva and Madanapāla, 109n
chāpavidyā, 45
chara, 110, 117
charādhyakṣa (an officer), 119
Charaka, 18-19
Charakasaṁhitā, 24
charaṭa, 63
charita (a source of law), 127
charma (a weapon), 187
charmin, 167
chāṭa, 63, 65
Chaulukya, 27, 33, 50, 104, 144, 157
——of Gujarat, 27n
——dynasty, 33
——'s import of horses, 169
chaurarakṣādhikārī, 144
Chedi, 15
chhandaśāstra, 176
chhina, 195
Chhattisgarh, 177
chhurikā (a kind of weapon), 186
Choḷas, 140, 177
chowrie, 199
Chowdhury, S. B., 3
civil administration, 97ff
code of conduct of the royal servants, 120-1
Coimbatore, 12
Colebrooke's Digest, 48n
Combay (port), 169
commander-in-chief, 111-2
composition of,
  akṣauhiṇi, 179
  anīkini, 179
  chamū, 179
  gaṇa, 179
  gulma, 179
  patti, 179
  pṛtanā, 179
  senāmukha, 179
  vāhini, 179
conciliation
  daivika——, 197
  lobhaja——, 197
  ——, nature and area of application, 196
consecration of Kālayavana, 49n

coronation ceremony, 48ff
  types of ——, 47
cow (protection of), 69
crimes, types of——, 133
Çrṅgāratilaka, 96n
crown-land, a source of revenue, 152
Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa, 1

D

Ḍāhala, 15
Dāhira of Sindh, 171n, 175
daivīśakti, 202
Dakṣa, 16
dāna (a limb of the state), 27
Dānasāgara, 10n
Dānamayūkha, 163n
daṇḍa, 125, 186, 200
——(a limb of the state), 28
daṇḍanātha (an officer), 110
daṇḍanīti, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44
Daṇḍaviveka, 139n
dāṇḍika (an officer), 144
Daṇḍin, 20, 24, 42, 45, 56
danti, 199n
dāraka, 142
darat, 142
Daśakumāracharita, 45n, 56, 58
Daśaratha, 40, 41, 48, 88, 92
Daśārṇa, 15
dauvārika (an officer), 109, 118
dāyāda, 72
De, S. K., 3, 3n, 19, 20, 20n, 25
definition of
——expenditure, 160
——*sāmanta*, 121
——*upekṣā*, 201
——*vyavahāra*, 125
Deo-Barnark Inscription of Jīvitagupta II, 103n, 118n
deśa, 140, 141, 142
deśādhikāriṇa (an officer), 141
deśahāraka, 200
deśanirvāsaka, 200
deśapāla (an officer), 141
deśasvāmī (an officer), 141
deśeśvara („), 141
deśika brāhmaṇas, 25
deśya, 199n
deva (an epithet of the king), 34, 35
Devala, 16
Devala Smṛti, 17
Devanāgari script, 25
devasama, 159
Devasthali, 17
devaścha pratimokṣaścha, 198
Devavṛddha, 32
Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories, 2
Devī (goddess), 13
devī (an epithet of the queen), 35
dhaman, 63
dhanādānam, 74
dhanādhyakṣa (an officer) 109, 118, 119n
Dhanañjaya, 22
dhanurveda. 6, 17, 41, 43, 44
dhanvin, 167
dhānyaharaṇa, 200
dharaṇivarāha (an epithet of the king), 34
dharma, 127, 130, 164
dharmādhikaraṇa, 110
Dharmāraṇya, 106n
dharmaśāstra, 6, 14, 41, 42, 46, 69, 100, 127, 156, 196
dharmāvatārasachiva, 97
dharmayuddha, 188
Dhātāra (god), 46
dhīguṇāḥ (qualities of the king), 39
dhīsachiva, 82
Dhumrākṣa, 102
Dhuṇḍirāja (commentator), 33
Dhureti Plates of Trailokyamalla, 143
dhvani school, 20
Dhvanyāloka, 20
Diddā, 12
difference between *amātya*, *sachiva* and *mantrin*, 82-83
Dikshitar, V. R. R., 1, 2
dispensing of justice, 72
ditya (a kind of tax), 155
dityogrāhaka (an officer), 155n
Divyatattva of Raghunandan, 131n
Dramila (a country), 74, 175
Draviḍas, 14
dravyadānamapurvaṁ (a kind of treaty), 198
Draupadī, 164

durāchārī, 63
durga, 149, 181
Durgā (worship), 162
durgabhaṅga, 200
durgādhyakṣa (an officer), 110
Durmukhī (goddess), 16
durvṛtta, 63
dūta, 109, 116-8
dūtaka, 113
Dutt, M. N., 28
dviṣat, 174
Dvyāśrayakāvya, 183

E

Ekākṣarākośa, 23
elephant
——for army, 168
importance of——, 171
danger of an untrained——, 171
enemy
kāryaja or *kṛtrima*——, 191
sahaja——, 191
types of——, 190
envoys
duties of the——, 117
qualifications of the——, 116
Europe, 122

F

Fahien, 80
feudatories
duties of the——, 123
Fish incarnation, 8
forts, 180-1
friends
types of——, 191

G

gadā (a weapon), 185
Gadādhara, 113
Gāhaḍavālas, 109, 144, 153
——inscriptions, 113
gajādhyakṣa (an officer), 109, 172
gajapati
title of——, 171, 173
gaṇaka, (an officer), 110
gaṇapa, 15
Gaṇapati, 49
Gāndhāra, 140
Gandhāra, 175
gandharvas,
gāndharvaveda, 6, 7
Gaṇeśa, 6, 12, 13
Gaṅgā, 7, 17, 25, 26
Gāṅgeyadeva (the Kalachuri king), 160n
Garga, 14
Garuḍa Purāṇa, 3, 8, 77n, 111, 112n
Gauḍa (Bengal), 74, 175
gauḍas, 175
Gaurī, 9
Gautama, 16, 153, 154
Gautama Smṛti, 152n, 161n
Gautama Dharmasūtra, 16
Gayā, 7, 17, 25, 26
Gayāmāhātmya, 17
gayāśrāddha, 26
Getty, Alice, 13
Ghoshal, U. N., 2, 3, 29, 127, 157
ghoṭakavigrahayuddha, 170
Ghugrahati Copper Plate Inscription of Samāchāradeva, 143
Girnār, 165
Gītā (*Śrīmadbhāgavat*), 5, 24
gochara, 153
gograha, 164, 200
Goharwa Plates of Karṇa, 75n, 103n
Gollāka, 86
——alias Gauḍa, 177
——the *amātya* of Yuvarājadeva, 102
Gonarda, 15
Gopāla, 94
gopālaka, 95
Gorakhanātha, 24
Gorakṣapaddhati, 23, 24
Govinda III, 39n
Govindachandra, 109
graha, 49, 52
Graharipu (king of Saurāṣṭra), 165
grāma, 142
grāmabhartā (an officer), 143, 145
grāmādhikāriṇa („), 141
grāmādhipati („), 142
grāmakuṭa („), 63
grāmaja, 199n
grāmanetara („), 144
grāmaṇī („), 143
grāmeśa („), 142
gṛha, 83n

gṛhasvāmī, 143
gṛhamantrī, 97
gṛhitasyānumodana, 198
Gupta, 14, 35, 68, 115, 141, 143, 144, 161, 205
Gurjara, 15, 74, 170, 175
——land grants, 145
Gurjara-Prathīhāra, 144, 166
Gujarāta, 164
Gwalior Inscription of Mihir Bhoja, 33

H

Halas, 15
Halāyudha, 19, 176
Haṁsamārga, 15n
Handiqui, 74
Hastyāyurveda, 171
hastipa, 172
hastivaidya, 172
Haradatta, 42
Harahūraba, 15n
Hari, 9, 31, 32, 46, 77
Hārīta, 16
Harivaṁśa (*Purāṇa*), 6, 7, 8, 9, 24
Harivaṁśa Purāṇa Kā Sāṁskṛtika Vivechana, 2
Harṣa, 34, 46, 59, 182
Harṣa (king of Kāśmīra), 171n
Harṣacharita, 15, 115n, 124, 146, 182n, 183
Harṣavardhana, 34, 163
Haṭha-Yoga, 23, 24
Hāthīgumpha Inscription of Khāravela, 45n
Haviṣmanta (god of Fire), 47
Hayagrīva, 9
hāyana, 199n
hayapati or *aśvapati* (title of), 173
Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra, 10, 11, 12, 13, 24
Hazra, R. C., 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 16, 17, 25
Hemchandra, 33, 183
Hemādri, 162, 163
Hiḍimbā, 201
Himalayas, 49
Hindu, 51
  four ideals of——life, 28
——kings, 164
——*Political Thought*, 27
——scriptures, 41
hiraṇya (a kind of tax), 152
Hoernle, 3
Hopkins, 48
horse-archery, 170
horse, importance of——, 169
Hoysala, 11
——army, 177
Huhuka, 15n
Huṇas, 175
Hsüan Tsang, 12n, 14, 40, 80, 132, 151, 153, 163, 167
——on military fiefs, 178

I

immunities from taxation, 158
important officers of the kingdom, 109ff
India, 8, 11, 29, 30, 35, 36, 143
  North-East——, 26
  North-West——, 15
  South——, 204
Indra, 32, 50, 51, 52, 162
  propitiation of——, 51
indrajāla, 206
indriyagrāma, 143
inter-state relations, 190ff
Īśānakalpa, 5, 6
Īśvara, 13
Īśvara (Śiva), 9
Īśvara Kṛṣṇa (a writer), 24
Itihāsa, 42, 43
Itihāsaveda, 42
itivṛtta, 42

J

Jabalpur Plates of Jayasiṁha, 76n, 103n, 107n
——Yaśaḥkarṇa, 107n
Jackson, A. M. T., 25
Jagatasiṁha, 115
Jamadagni, 164
Jain, 54, 100
——literature, 50
——monk, 33
——*sūtras*, 11, 202
——writers, 33
Jaiswal, K. P., 2
jāla, 18
Jalaṁdhara, 15
janapada, 29, 139, 140, 142

——a limb of the state, 27
jānapadāḥ, 85
janapadasamuddeśa, 142
janatrāṇam, 124
janādhyakṣa, 119n
janāṅgachhedana, 200
jaṅghāchārikanāyaka (chief of emissaries), 120
Jātakas, 102
Jayanta (god), 47
Jayapura, 162
Jayasiṁha Siddharāja, the great, 41
jigīṣu, 190
Jimūtavāhana, 126n
Jīvānanda, 96
Jīvitagupta II, 118
jñāna, 164
jñātipūga, 134
jṛmbhāstra (a weapon), 186
judicial administration, 125ff
judicial fine, 135
Jurz, 164

K

Kachchha, 11
Kadamba dynasty, 46
Kādambarī, 44, 45, 57, 115n
Kahala Plates of Sodhadeva, 112n, 144n
Kaikeya, 140
Kaikeyī, 48
kalā, 45
Kalachuris, 12, 15, 153, 177
——of Ratanpur, 177
——of Tripurī, 86, 102
Kalachuri-Chedi era, 75
——grants, 112
——inscriptions, 156
Kālāgni, 5
Kalahandi, 12
Kālidāsa, 7, 45, 153
Kālikā Purāṇa, 3, 88n
Kaliṅga, 11, 14, 15, 140, 175
——Rock Edict I, 64n
Kāliñjara, 60
Kallar, the Vazir of Lagaturman, 64
kalpa, 7
kalpāstra (a weapon), 186
kāma, 71
Kāmandaka, 17, 28, 29, 30, 37, 39, 42, 43, 48, 60, 61, 63, 72, 73, 74, 82, 83, 84, 92, 94, 97, 101, 107, 108, 116, 119, 123, 148, 149, 157, 165, 166, 167, 171, 172, 174, 176, 178, 180, 182, 183, 187, 191, 193, 194, 195, 197, 198, 201, 206
Kāmandaka Nītisāra, 28, 84, 92, 124, 155n, 161n, 164n, 183n, 187n, 188, 202n
Kāmarūpa, 11, 15
Kāmasūtra, 41, 115
Kamauli grant (I) and (II), 109n
Kamboja, 15n, 175
kanakādhyakṣa (an officer), 110, 119
Kanauj, 114, 116
Kaṇaśva Inscription of Şivagaṇa, 175
Kāñchī, 11
kaṇḍarā, 18
Kane, P. V., 3, 17, 19, 20, 137
Kannaḍa script, 11
Kāṇva, 68
kanyā, 199n
kapāla, 194
karādānam, 74
karaja, 199n
Karakaṇṭha, 15n
Karālī (goddess), 16
Kāritalāi Inscription of Lakṣmaṇarāja II, 87n
——Stone Inscrip ion of Lakṣmaṇarāja II, 84, 146
Karkka, 39n
karmasachiva, 97
kārmuka (a weapon), 186
Karṇa, 161n
Karṇāṭas, 175
karṇavedha, 14
Karpūramañjarī, 21
karṣāpaṇas, 136
Kārtavīrya Arjuna, 67, 164
karttari (a weapon), 186
Kāśī, 15
Kasia Stone Inscription, 170
Kāśmīra, 11, 12, 15, 67, 175
——army, 77
Kathāsaritsāgara, 36n, 60, 66, 71, 92, 94, 95, 97
kaṭṭāri (a weapon), 186
Kātyāyana, 16, 108, 128, 129, 130, 131, 149, 155n

——*Smṛti*, 37
kaumudavrata, 9
Kauravas, 164, 199
kauṭumba, 145
——*kṣetra*, 145
Kauṭilya, 30, 39, 42, 43, 44, 50, 54, 55, 56, 58, 62, 71, 72, 74, 76, 80, 82, 85, 89, 92, 99, 102, 107, 120, 138, 149, 150, 153, 154, 161, 171, 172, 173, 174, 176, 179, 193, 194, 195, 202n, 203
Kāverī, 11
kāvya, 44
Kāvyādarśa, 20
Kāvyālaṁkārasūtra, 8n
Kāvyamīmāṁsā, 15n, 20, 21, 21n
kāyasthas, 63
——a danger to the people, 67
kelisachiva, 95
Kekaya, 15n
Kerala, 140
Keśava, an army general of mixed caste, 177
kevalāstra (a weapon), 186
Khairha Plates of Yaśaḥkarṇa, 103n, 107n, 160n, 166n
Khajuraho, 12
Khalimpur Copper Plate of Dharmapāla, 169n
kharvaṭa, 122, 140
  area of a——, 147
khaṭvāṅga (a weapon), 186
kheṭaka, 122, 140
khila land, 121
Khoh Copper Plates of Mahārājā Hastin, 65
Khoh Grant of Mahārājā Jayanātha, 65n
kinds of
——persons amenable to division, 197
King
——and the caste, 35
coronation ceremony of the——, 46ff
daily routine of the——, 55ff
divinity of the——, 32ff
duties and functions of the——, 58ff
——s' duties compared to sacrifices, 76
gradation of the——, 34-35
maintenance of temples by the——, 75
position of the——, 77
privileges of the——, 78ff
qualifications of the——, 36ff
Sanskrit synonyms for the——, 34-35
——to provide livelihood to all, 75
——to win the affection and loyalties of the people, 76
kingship
  British principles of——, 50
  Indian principles of——, 51
Kīra (country), 15n
Kīras, 15
Kirāṭa, 63n
kirātas, 15
Kitava (the *narmasachiva*), 95
Kokalla II, 107
Kola, 140
Koṅkaṇa, 11, 15
Konow, Sten, 21, 21n
koṣa, 129, 131, 166
——(a limb of the state), 27
Kośala, 11, 15
koṣapāla (an officer), 103, 110
kramukapāka, 21n
krīḍāsachiva, 95
krīḍāsakhā, 95
kṛpāṇa (a weapon), 185
Kṛṣṇa, 199
Kṛṣṇadeva, 60n
Kṛṣṇadevarāya of Vijayanagara, 183
kṛtrima, 190
Kṛtyakalpataru of *Rājadharmakāṇḍa*, 31
Kṣapaṇaka (author), 23, 24
kṣatriya (an epithet of the king), 34
Kṣemagupta, 12
kṣepaṇī (a weapon), 184, 185
kṣitichāriṇaḥ, 159
Kubera, 32
Kubjikā (a goddess), 16
Kudagere Plates of Vijayaśiva Māndhātrivarman, 96n
Kukura, 15
kula, 145
Kulattuṅga I Choḷa, 177
Kulikas, 175
Kullūka Bhaṭṭa, 39, 46n, 73n, 74, 149n, 156, 193
Kulūta, 15n
kulya, 190
kumārāmātya, 103
Kumārapāla, 50, 59, 60n

Kumārapāla-Pratibodha, 50n
kumārasachiva, 97
Kumārilabhaṭṭa, 25, 204
kuṇḍalinī, 23
kuñjarabandhana, 73, 149
kunta (a weapon), 186
Kuntala, 96
Kuntī, 41
kuṭhāra (a weapon), 186
kūrchas, 18
Kūrma Purāṇa, 2
Kuru, 15
Kurukṣetra, 17
kuṭumbas, 143
kuṭumbins, 146

L

laguḍa (a weapon), 185
Lahiri, 19, 20
Lakṣaṇaprakāśa, 169n, 171n, 174, 185n
Lakṣmaṇa, 72
Lakṣmaṇarāja II, 87, 146
Lakṣmaṇasena, 182n
Lakṣmī, 64
Lakṣmīdhara, 85, 161, 197, 198n
Lalitāditya (king of Kāśmīra), 114
Lalitavistara, 11
lāṅgala, 186
Lavaṇaprasāda (the Chaulukya king), 177
law of inheritance, 153
Law, N. N., 2, 47n, 48n
law, sources of, 127
laṅkeśvara-nārāyaṇāvatāra (an epithet of Bhīmadeva), 33
Lāṭas, 175
lawsuits
  definition and initiation of——, 127
lekhaka, 109, 118, 144, 145
Liebach, B., 22
Likhita, 16
——*pramāṇa*, 129
Liṁpāka, 15n
Liṅgakāṇḍa (of *Hayasīrṣa Pañcharātra*), 13
litigation, 132
  eighteen branches of——, 127-8
  sub-branches of——, 128
Lohadaitya, 185
Lokāyata, 42
—— school, 42
Lombards, 166

M

Madanapārijāta, 154
Mādhava, 19
——(the *mahāmātya* of Karṇa), 106n
Mādhavāchārya, 96
Mādhavanidāna, 19
Madhyadeśa, 25
madhyama, 191
madhyastha, 191
Madras, 15
Magadha, 15, 175
māgadha, 111
Māgha, 95
Mahābhārata, 6, 7, 8, 11, 24, 25, 27, 34, 47, 88, 89, 94, 156, 157, 158, 179, 182, 199
Mahābhāṣya (of Patañjali), 98
mahākumārāmātya, 103
mahāmantrī, 82, 103
mahāmātra, 82, 123
mahāmātya, 82, 84, 103, 104
mahāpañchakulikas, 144
mahāpramattavāra, 174
mahārājā (an epithet of the king), 34
Mahārāṣṭra, 11, 13n
mahāsāhasika, 63
mahāsāmanta, 103
mahāsaṁkulayuddha, 172
mahāsāndhivigrahika (an officer), 103
mahāśvasādhanika („), 170, 173
mahattamas („), 144
mahattara („), 143, 144, 145, 206
Mahendra (brother of Aśoka), 40
māhendra circle, 14, 15
Mahendravarman, 46
Mahodara, 102
Majhagāwaṁ Copper Plate of Mahārajā Hastin, 65n
Malabar
  import of horses into——, 169
Mālatīmādhava, 6

Mālavas, 15, 175
Malayasiṁha, 170
Mallikārjuna, 177
Mālwa, 102
māṁsarajju, 18
mānasika (disease), 18
Maner Copper Plate of Govindachandradeva, 109n
maṇḍala, 140, 142
maṇḍalādhipati (an epithet of the king), 34, 142
maṇḍaleśvara, 35, 121
Mandarāchala (mountain), 64
Mānkīra
  king of, 164
Mañjulikā, 95
mannapa, 63
mantra, 165
mantramukta weapons, 186
mantrī, 82, 99, 109
mantrimukhya, 113
mantrin, 97, 106
mantripradhāna, 84
Manu, 16, 31, 32, 35, 37, 42, 56, 69, 88, 116, 121n, 125, 125n, 126, 128, 129, 138, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 156, 157, 158, 160, 196n, 199, 200, 202
Manus, 7, 53
Manu Smṛti, 31, 56, 68, 139, 147, 157, 194
Manu Vaivaśvata, 32
mānyaka, 63, 64
Marāṭhī script, 11
Mārgaśīrṣa, 141
Māridatta, 95
Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, 1, 2, 3, 160
Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa : eka Sāṁskṛtika Adhyayana, 2
maṭhas, 123
matisachiva, 97
Matsya (country), 15
Matsya Purāṇa, 1, 2, 3, 5, 17, 24, 25, 30, 31, 36n, 37, 42, 61, 88n, 108n, 110, 111, 114, 116, 119n, 121, 160, 166n, 181, 196n, 197, 199, 202, 204
Matsya Purāṇa, A Study, 1
Matsyendranātha, 24
Mau Inscription of Chandella king Mahendravarman, 113n
maula, 85, 86, 174
Maurice, the Roman Emperor, 167
Mauryas, 120, 166, 205
Maurya race, 175
Medhātithi, 33, 34, 35, 39, 73n, 74, 147, 149n, 154
Medinīkoṣa, 95
Merutuṅga, 59
Mihira Bhoja, 33, 46, 60, 177
mimāṁsā, 6, 7, 43, 45
mīna-ketanas, 24
Mīnānātha, 24
ministers 82ff
  caste qualification of——, 86
  financial duties of——, 90
  fivefold division of deliberations with ——, 91
—, for war and peace, 114
  functions of——, 89ff
  influence of——, 92-93
  judicial functions of——, 90
  military duties of——, 90
  number of——, 88
  place of deliberations with——, 89
  qualifications of——, 84ff
  time and place for consulation with ——, 88
—to protect the king, 92
  types of consultations with——, 91
Mirashi, 112, 143, 145, 155
Mitākṣarā, 17, 42, 65, 67, 108, 117, 128, 129, 130, 131n, 137, 146, 149, 156, 193
mitārtha, 117
mitra (an element of the state), 28
Mitramiśra, 37n, 39, 65, 152, 193
Mitraśarman, 114
mlechchhas, 8, 22, 165
——as envoy, 117
Monghyr Copper Plate of Devapāla, 103, 175n
Monier-Williams, 94, 96
Mṛchchhakaṭika, 67n, 131n
mṛdvikāpāka, 21
Mṛgendravarman, 46
mudgara (a weapon), 185
Mudrārākṣasa, 32
Muhammad Ibn Bakhtiyar, 182n
mukhyāmātya, 54
mukuṭabandha, 52

muktāmukta weapon, 186
muktasandhārita weapon, 184
mūla, 115
Multan, 164
Mūlarāja, the Chaulukya king of Aṇahilavāḍa, 33, 165
Muñja, 46, 176
Munshi, 147
mūsala, 186
Muslim, 8, 10, 16, 164
——invaders, 165, 201
——invasions, 176
muṣṭi, 186
Murāri, 102
Murārimiśra, 38, 64
mūrdhābhiṣikta (an epithet of the king), 34, 46

N

Nāgabhaṭa I, 33
Nāgabhaṭa II, 33
Nāgānanda, 46
nāgapāśa (a weapon), 186
nagara, 140, 142, 147
Nāgara script, 11, 12
nagaraśreṣṭhi, 144
nagaravyāvahārika, 64n
Nāga-Vākāṭaka, 68
naigamāḥ, 54
Naiṣadhīyacharitam, 116n, 155n
Nalanda Copper Plate of Devapāla, 103n, 175n
——Dharmapāla, 103n, 175n
Nāndi, 47
Nārada, 9, 10, 16, 17, 32, 34, 77, 93, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 138, 139, 153, 158, 204
Nāradanīti, 34
Nāradapañcharātra, 10
Nārada Smṛti, 126, 137
Nāradīyaṣikṣā, 22, 24
narapati (title of), 173
Narasiṁha (*Purāṇa*), 2
Narasiṁhagupta, 34
Naravāhanadatta, 60, 95
Nārāyaṇa, 9, 33, 46
Nārāyaṇapāla, 39n
narendra (an epithet), 34
nārikelapāka, 21
Narmadā (river), 11, 17
narma, 94, 95
narmasachiva, 94ff, 97
——Bhoganātha, 96
——Chārāyaṇa, 96
  duties of the——, 95
  position of the——, 97
narmasuhṛd, 95
Nātha sect, 24
Nāṭyaśāstra, 20, 22n
naya, 114
Nayachandrasūri, 106
nāyaka (an officer), 110, 179, 183
nigama, 142
niketana, 83n
Nīlakaṇṭha, 144
Nīlakaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa, 39, 42, 53, 107, 162
nīrājana, 173
nirāśraya, 126
nisṛṣṭārtha, 117
Nītimayūkha, 49, 53, 98n, 99n, 116n, 117, 166n, 182n, 191n
Nītiprakāśikā, 31, 62, 73, 74, 83, 88, 89, 123, 125n, 128n, 129, 140n, 147, 149n, 160, 166n, 167, 168, 177, 179, 183, 184, 185, 187, 188, 190, 192, 194, 196, 197, 198, 200
Nītisāra, 17, 85, 112, 199
Nītiśāstra, 46
Nītivākyāmṛta, 28, 43, 44, 63, 82, 85, 86, 91, 98n, 99, 107, 116, 117, 120, 125n, 128n, 142, 159, 171n, 177n, 191n, 192, 194, 198n
nivāsa, 83n
niyoga, 41
non-Aryans, 168
nṛpa (an epithet of the king), 34, 35
nṛpati (an epithet of the king), 34
nṛpāśraya, 126
nyāya, 6, 7, 42

O

officers
——in charge of various units of an army, 179-80
  qualifications of other——, 118
Ojha, G. H., 11, 12n
Orissa, 25

P

padmāsana, 23
padātibala, 167
Padma Purāṇa, 2, 5, 8
Padmāvatī, 92
Pāla, 26, 74, 94, 113, 118, 144, 165, 170, 171
——inscriptions, 175
——king,
gift of horses to the king——, 169
Pālakāpya, 18, 171
Palitana Plate, 65
pallava (a kind of *mantra*), 16
paṇas, 131, 135
pañchagavya, 52
pañchakula, 143, 147
pañchakuladharmādhikaraṇa, 143
pañchakulikas, 144
pañchakuṭumba, 146
Pañchāla, 175
Pañcharātra, 5, 10, 11, 24
——(by Bhāsa), 161n
Pandey, Rajabali, 11n
——, Veenapani, 2
Paṇḍavas, 8, 49, 164
Pāṇḍya, 140
Pāṇinī, 22
Panjab, 175
paṇya, 152
parā knowledge, 6
paridūṣaṇa or *paribhūṣaṇa*, 195
paramadaivata (an epithet of the king), 34
paramāśtra (a kind of weapon), 184, 187
Paraśurāma, 164
Pargiter, 1
parihāsasahāya, 95
parikrama, 195
Parīkṣita, 49
Parjanya (god), 75
pārṣṇigrāha, 191
pārṣṇimūla, 192
paryaṅka, 23
paryāyokta, 20
pāśa (a weapon), 185
pāṣaṇḍins, 8
Pāśupata, 9
Pāṭaliputra, 95
Patil, 1
paṭṭabandha, 167
pattana, 147
paṭṭiśa, 185, 186
pattis, 167
pauras (a limb of the state), 27, 64
——, a danger to the people, 64-66
pauramukhyāḥ, 54
pauravas, 15
paurogavādhyakṣa (an officer), 109
pāvaka, 32
payment of salary to the Rāṣṭrakuṭa soldiers, 177
peśi, 19
pichumandapāka, 21n
Piṇākapāṇi, 33
Piṅgala, 176
Piṅgalamata, 11
Piṅgalasūtra, 19, 24
piśāchas, 53
Pitāmaha, 58, 131
Poddar, 19
policy of
——*āsana*, 193
——bribery, 198
——*dāna*, 199
——dissension,
——duplicity, 193
——*indrajāla*, 196, 200, 201
——*māyā*, 196, 200, 201
——peace, 194
——*saṁśraya*, 193
——*sandhi*, 193
——*upāya*, 196
——*upekṣā*, 196, 200
——*vigraha*, 193
——*yāna*, 193
Political Thoughts in the Purāṇas, 3
Prabandhachintāmaṇi, 59, 106n
Prabhākara, 46
Prabhāsa, 165
pradhāna, 82, 84
prāḍvivāka, 102, 108, 110, 129
Pradyumna, 9
Prahasta, 102
prakīrṇaka, 126
pramāda, 134
prāśa (a weapon), 184, 186
Prasad, Beni, 2
Pratāpavardhana, 50
prathama, 16

prathamakāyastha, 144
prathamakulika, 144
pratidāna, 198
pratīhāra, 52, 56, 74, 80, 82, 109, 112ff, 113, 128, 144, 165, 205
Pratīhāra inscriptions, 156
Pratīhāra kings, 170
pratikāra, 95
pratipattija, 199n
pratyanteṣu, 85
pratyāstra (a weapon), 184
Pravarasena II, 46
praviṣṭāścha, 189
Prayāga, 7, 17, 26
Prāyaśa (country), 175
prince
  curriculam of education for the——, 41ff
Prince of Wales Museum Plates of Jayabhaṭa IV, 143n
Priyadarśikā, 46
protection
  explanation of——, 68
  ——of the king against the prince, 71
  ——of the king, 69
  ——of the prince, 72
  ——of the queen, 71
  ——of the *varṇāśramadharma*, 69
Pṛthivī, 32
pṛthivīpati (an epithet of the king), 34, 35
Pṛthu, 31, 46
Pulakeśina, 34
Puṇḍra, 140
pura, 122, 147
purasvāmī (an officer), 141, 147
purī, 142
Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, 1
Purāṇasaṁhitā, 25
Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs, 2
purohita, 84, 123
——Jāguka, 109
puruṣāntara, 195
purvabādhaka, 127
purvasādhaka, 127
Puṣkara, 17, 25, 72
puṭabhedana, 147
putrakāmeṣṭhiyajña, 41

R

Raghavan, 19, 20
Raghu, 45
Raghuvaṁśa, 8, 32n, 49n, 115, 155n, 157
Raghunandana, 126n
rahasyādhikata, 96
rahasya, 96
rahasyādhikṛta (an officer), 96
rahasya-sahāya, 96
Rahma (king of), 169
rājā, 34, 35, 36
rājadharma, 7, 17, 46, 125
Rājadharmakāṇḍa of Kṛtyakalpataru, 36n, 55n, 68n, 88, 115n, 116n, 148n, 149n, 152n, 161n
Rājadharmakaustubha, 46n, 51
Rājagṛha, 17
rājāmātya, 103
Rājanīti, 48, 49n
Rājanītikāmadhenu, 34, 35
Rājanītiprakāśa, 31, 36n, 63n, 98n, 112n, 115n, 116n, 150, 152n, 154, 156n, 182n, 183n, 191n, 193, 197n, 198
Rājanītiratnākara, 34, 88, 107, 193
rājanya (an epithet of the king), 34, 35
Rajaputana, 175
Rājaśekhara, 15, 20, 21, 22, 25, 84, 90, 95
Rājataraṅgiṇī, 67, 113n, 114n, 115n, 146, 170n, 175, 182n
rājarājeśvara, 34, 35, 121, 127
rājasūya, 46, 47
rājasūyābhiṣeka, 52
Rājavāhana, 45
rājavidyā, 38
Rāja-Yoga, 23
Rajim Stone Inscription of Pṛthivīdeva II, 146n, 174
rājya, 28, 30
rakṣaka, 109, 118
rakṣārthādhikṛta, 144
rākṣasas, 53
Rāma, 7, 47, 48, 72, 164
Rāmachandra, 47, 50, 64, 92
Rāmacharita, 113
Rāmapāla, 124
Ramaṭha, 15n
Rāmāyaṇa, 6, 7, 8, 24, 47, 88, 146, 196n

Ranipur-Jural, 12
Rapson, 12
rasas (six types), 18
Rashid-ud-Din, 115n, 169
rāṣṭra, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 139, 140, 141, 142, 204
rāṣṭravyasana, 29
rāṣṭrādhikṛta (an officer), 140
rāṣṭrādhipati, 140
Rāṣṭrakuṭas, 74, 100, 140, 144, 165, 171
rāṣṭrapāla, 140
rāṣṭrapālikā, 140
rāṣṭrapati, 140
rathī or *mahārathī*, 174
Ratnāvalī, 46
Ratnavardhana, 113
Rāvaṇa, 88, 95, 102, 164
relative importance of the sources of law, 127
Revatī, 14
revenue
  eight sources of——, 149
Rewa Stone Inscription of Karṇa, 170, 174, 177n
——of Vijayasiṁha, 97n, 115n, 170
Rewa Plates of Vijayasiṁha, 76n, 174
Ṛgvedic school, 52
rise of monasteries, 123
rītis, types of, 20
ṛjuḥ, 111
Ṛk-veda, 42
rodhaka, 16
Romans, 166
Roman coins, 151
Royal Asiatic Society's (London) Grant of V. E. 1266, 33
royal chamberlain
  function of the——, 113
royal priest
  powers and position of—, 107
  duties of the——, 107
royal privileges, 78ff
Rudra, 5, 9
Rudrabhaṭṭa, 24, 96
Rudradāmana, 45n, 83
Rudraṭa, 24
Rudrayāmala, 25
rukmaja, 199n
rūpaka, 20, 22

S

Śabdakalpadruma, 95
śabdālaṁkāra, 21
śabdārthālaṁkāra, 21
Sabhāparva, 144, 177n
Śabaras, 14
sabhāsada, 109, 118
sabhyas, 110, 129
sachivas, 52, 54, 82, 89, 97, 101, 104, 121
sadana, 83n
saḍbhāga, 156
sahaja (disease), 18
sahakārapāka, 21n
sāhasādhipati, 144
Sāhityadarpaṇa, 22n
Sahuḍa, 15n
Saindhavas, 15
Śaivāgama, 5, 7, 13, 25
Śaivatantra, 9
Śaka, 15n
sakara (type of king), 35
śākhānagara, 147
Śākta-worship, 7, 9
Śakti, 9
Śaktiyāmala, 25
Śākuntala, 153
śalākā, 186
salāmī, 154
Śālihotra, 18
sāma (a limb of the state), 27
samādhi, 20
sāmanta, 54, 124
sāmantachakra, 124
sāmantapatti, 124
samāvartana, 44
samāsokti, 20
Sāmaveda, 42
saṁdhi, 18
Saṁgama II (Vijayanagara king), 97
saṁgrāmavijayavidyā, 206
Saṁhitā, 13
saṁhitāmantra, 13
Samīra, 32
Śaṅkarāchārya, 204
Śaṅkarāsaṁhitā, 5n
Saṁkarṣaṇa, 9
Saṁkarṣaṇakāṇḍa (of the *Hayaśirṣa Pañcharātra*), 10

Sāṁkhyakārikā, 24
sampuṭa, 16
samrāṭ (an epithet of the king), 34
saṁsada, 117
Saṁskāraprakāśa, 14n
samudragṛha, 159
Samudra-gupta, 34
Saṁvarta, 16
saṁyoga, 195
Sāñchī Inscription of Chandra-gupta II, 143n
sāndhivigrahika, 89, 101, 109, 112, 114
sangata, 194
Sankaran (author), 19, 20
Śankaravarman, 113
Śaṅkha, 16, 132
Śaṅkhalikhita Smṛti, 37, 85, 139, 161
Śaṅkhanaka, 95
santāna, 194
Śāntiparva, 27, 31, 125, 140n, 147, 158, 161n, 166, 167n, 185
śāntyābhiṣeka, 53
saptāṅga theory of state, 27
saptarātra sect, 10
saptija, 199n
Śāradā, 12
Śāradā script, 11
śāraṅga, 186
Śāraṅgadharapaddhati, 171
Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharaṇa, 20
sārathī, 109
śārīrika (disease), 18
sārthavāha, 144
sārvabhauma (an epithet of the king), 34
sarvasvaharaṇa, 200
sarvatobhadra, 183
Sarvavarman (Maukharī king), 69
śāsana, 199n
śāsanahāraka, 117
Śāstrī, Īśvarachandra, 20
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 47n
Śātātapa, 6
saṭṭaka (a form of drama), 21
sattra, 163
śaulbika, 110, 144
śaulkika (an officer), 110, 159
saumya, 51
Saurakāṇḍa (of *Hayaśīrṣa Pañcharātra*), 13
Saurāṣṭra, 15, 165
Savitara, 51
Sāyaṇāchārya, 96
senānipramukha, 110
senāpati, 109, 111, 179, 180, 183
setu, 153
Sharma, R. S., 123
Shāstrī, Haraprasād, 2, 3, 8, 22, 25
Shāstrī, Jagdishlal, 3
Seorinārāyaṇa Inscription of Jājalladeva II, 174
Siddha-Hema, 33n
siddhānta, 13
Siddharāja (Chaulukya king), 50, 59
siddhas, 53
śikṣā, 7
śimbidhānya, 149
sīmāntachārī, 110
Sindh, 175
Śiprā (river), 50
śirā, 19
Śiraśchheda-jayadrathayāmala, 11
Śiśupālavadha, 95
Sītā, 64, 164, 185
Sītārāma (commentator), 73, 149n, 188n
śīta-vīrya, 18
Śiva, 9, 12, 13, 33, 49
  (*Upapurāṇa*), 24
Śivadharma (*Upapurāṇa*), 24, 162, 163
Śivājī, 51, 84, 88, 183
Śivarājadeva, 113
śivamantra, 13
sīvanya, 18
Śiva-rahasyakāṇḍa (of *Skanda Purāṇa*), 5
Śivaratha (a rougish kāyastha), 67
Śivasaṁhitā, 13, 25
Śivaśāstra, 13, 25
sixfold diplomacy, 193
Skanda, 9, 13
Skanda Purāṇa, 33, 142
skandhāvāra, 101
skandhopaneya, 195
Slavs, 166
Smith, V., 1
smṛtis, 24, 125, 126, 127, 134, 198
Smṛtichandrikā, 58, 128, 131n
snāyu, 18
soḍaṣa mahājanapadas, 140

soldiers
——a danger to the people, 65-66
gradation of——, 174
mercenary——, 175
  pay and allowances of——, 177
  qualifications of——, 175
  six types of——, 174
Soma (god), 46, 47, 158
Somadevabhaṭṭa, 71
Somadeva Sūri, 28, 33, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 54, 55, 56, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 69, 70, 71, 72, 76, 86, 88, 98, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 111, 114, 117, 118, 120, 132, 138, 139, 148, 151, 154, 157, 160, 161, 168, 171, 191, 192, 193, 198, 202
Somanātha, 41
Some Aspects of the Vāyu Purāṇa, 1
Someśvarabhaṭṭa, 87
Someśvaradeva, 27, 37, 44, 63, 64, 73, 101, 107, 111, 115, 119, 125, 126, 128, 129, 131, 139, 141, 151, 152, 157, 162, 163, 168, 171, 172, 174, 178, 182, 193, 194, 197, 198, 199
spoils of war, 155
śrāddha, 136
śreṇi, 174
śreṇis (a limb of state), 27
Śrī (goddess), 49
Śrimadbhāgavata Purāṇa, 2
śrimadādivarāha (an epithet), 33
śṛṅgāra, 94
——*rasa*, 20
——*sahāya*, 94, 95, 96
Śṛṅgāraprakāśa, 20
Śrutadeva Sūri, 96
Śrutasāgara, 120n
śruti, 44
śrutivedin, 129
sthalaśulka (a tax), 151
sthāna, 146, 147, 164
sthānadāha, 200
sthānādhikṛta (an officer), 146
sthānaka (,,), 146
sthānalaka (,,), 146
sthānapala (,,), 146, 153
sthānapati (,,), 146
sthānīya (,,), 147
sthapati (,,), 110, 119
sthiti, 114
St. Petersberg Dictionary, 95
Strategicon (book), 167
Studies in the Upapurāṇas, 2
subhagā, 64
——, a danger to the people, 63-64
subhagāḥ, 63
sūdādhyakṣa, 109, 118
śūdras as *amātya*, 129
Sugrīva, 164
suhṛd, 174
śukadhānya, 149
Śukanāsa, 33
Śukra, 98
Śukranīti, 35n, 98n, 177
Śukranītisāra, 144, 145, 162, 163
śūla (a weapon), 185
Sulaiman, 164, 169, 177
śulka, 150
śulkagrāha, 144
Sumantra, 94
Sumukhī (a goddess), 16
Śuṅga, 68
Śūrasena, 175
Surāṣṭras, 15
Surat Plate of Maitraka Vyāghrasena, 65n
Sureśvara, 8
Sūryasiddhānta, 58n
Suśruta, 18, 19
Suśrutasaṁhita, 24
Sūśruta school of medicine, 18
Sūtrakṛtāṅga, 202
svāmī, 27, 31, 34, 35
svaraśāstra, 45
Svargārohaṇa Parva, 8
Svastika, 23
svayaṁgrāhapravarttana, 198
sword
  mythical origin of——, 185

T

Tafāk (Tafan) king of——, 169
Tairabhukta (Tirhut), 175
talāra, 63
tāmasa Purāṇa, 5
tāmbūladhārī, 109, 205
tāmbūladāyaka, 115
tāmbūladhara, 115
tāmbūlādhikāra, 115
tāmbūlavāhaka, 115

tāmbūlavāhinī, 115
tāmbūlavāka, 115
—*tāmbūlika*, 115
Tamil script, 11
Taṅgaṇa, 14, 15n
ṭaṅkakas, 116
tantrapoṣaṇa, 101
tantra
  sixfold purpose of——, 16
  six types of——, 16
Tapantaka, 95
Tārā (a goddess), 16
taraśulka (a tax), 151
Tarkapañchānana, Jagannātha, 48
tarkavidyā, 42
taskara, 63
tathya treaty, 196
Taxila, 64
thānā, 146
theory of *avanirandhranyāya*, 122
——*bhūmichhidranyāya*, 121
——circle of twelve states, 191-3
——seven limbs of states, 204
——three types of energies, 201
Theory of Government in Ancient India, 2
Tigula script, 11
Timana Grant of Mehra Jagamalla, 53
tintiḍīkapāka, 21n
Tippera Copper Plate of Lokanātha, 177
Tirhut, 74
tīrthas, 7
Tīrthaprakāśa, 25n
town, area of a——, 147
tomara (a weapon), 184
Traikuṭakas of Chedi, 155
Traiyambakadhanurveda, 185
trapuṣapāka, 21n
trayī, 38, 41, 42, 44
treasure-trove (a source of revenue), 152
treasury
  importance of——, 148
treaty
  persons unfit for——, 195
  types of——, 194-5
Tripurī, 96
tṛṇayuti, 153
Turkish invaders, 206
Turuṣka, 15n, 175
Tuṣāra, 15n
Tvaritā (a goddess), 16
types of *daṇḍa*, 125
——of bribery, 198
——of punishments, 200

U

udāharaṇa, 42
udāsina, 191, 192
Udayagiri Cave Inscription, 101
Udayana (king of Vatsa), 92, 93, 95, 97
Udbhaṭa, 24
Udyogaparva, 116, 125
Umā, 49
upagraha, 195
upahāra, 155, 194
upanidhi, 152
upaniṣads, 24
upanyāsa, 195
uparūpaka, 22
upavedas, 6, 43
urastrāṇa, 170
Uśanaśa, 16, 42
uṣṇa-vīrya, 18
Uttarāpatha, 15, 16, 74
utility of chariot, 173
——of elephant corps, 172
Utpala, 14, 16, 182
utprekṣā, 20
utsāhaguṇa, 39

V

Valabhī Grant of Dhārasena II, 65
Vāchaspatyam, 95
Vāgīśvarī, 9
Vahlava, 15n
Vāhlika, 14, 15
vaidehaka, 15
Vaijayantī, 158
Vāiṣṇavāgama, 6, 25
Vaiśvadevatā, 51
vājapeya sacrifice, 47
vajra (a weapon), 185
Vallabharāja (a feudatory), 177
Vallālasena, 10, 11, 24, 204
Vāmana, 8, 24
vanādāna, 74
Vaṇḍurāja (a śudra general), 177
Vaṅga, 14, 140, 175
Vaṅgasena, 19

Vaṇigvarāḥ, 54
Vaṅkala (country), 175
Vapulla, 102, 170
Vārāha (*Purāṇa*), 2
Varāhamihira, 14, 15, 23, 76, 115
Vārāṇasī, 17
Vārddhuṣika, 63
Varga (commentator), 86
Variṣṭhaka, 120
varṇāśrama, 114
    upholding of——, 69
vārtā, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44
vārtākapāka, 21n
Vartantu, 45
Varuṇa, 32, 49, 72
——circle, 14, 15
vasana, 199n
Vāsavadattā, 92, 95
Vasiṣṭha, 5, 6, 16, 94, 125, 153, 154, 160n, 161
——*Smṛti*, 76n
Vastupāla, 177
Vasudeva, 9
Vātsyāyana, 115
Vātavyādhi, 194
Vāyavīyasaṁhitā, 23, 24
Vāyavya circle, 14, 15
Vāyu Purāṇa, 2, 9, 17, 24, 26, 160
Vedas, 5, 6, 7, 11, 24, 38, 42, 43, 45, 107
vedāṅgas, 42
Vedānta, 5, 42
velākara (a tax), 199n
Verma, 19, 187
veśyā, 199n
vibhāvanā, 20
Vidarbha, 16
Viddhaśālabhañjikā, 84, 92n, 96, 103
***viduṣaka*, 96**
Vigrahapāla, abdication of——, 39n
vijayasnāna, 183
Vikramaśakti, 94
village-head
    appointment of——, 142
    position of——, 145
vinichchaya, 102
Vīrachintāmaṇī Dhanurveda, 171
Vīramitrodaya, 85, 108, 132n, 146, 155n
Vīrasena, 101
virāṭ, 34
Vīra-Valañjiyas, 177
viṣaya, 140, 141, 142, 161
viṣayeśvara (an officer), 141
viśeṣokti, 20
Visigoths, 166
Viṣṇu, 5, 6, 7, 9, 32, 33, 49, 50, 51, 52, 64, 69, 77, 78, 149, 150n, 152n, 160, 203
——circle, 10
Viṣṇudharma (*Upapurāṇa*), 24
Viṣṇudharmottara, 3, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 37, 42, 43, 49, 50, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 61, 63, 65, 75, 76, 84, 85, etc.
Viṣṇudharmasūtra, 140n, 158
Viṣṇu Purāṇa, 1, 2, 9, 24, 90n
Viṣṇurahasya, 10, 11, 24
Viṣṇu Smṛti, 157n, 159n
viṣṭi, 167
Viśvanātha, 22
Viśvarūpa, 17, 42, 112, 130, 137
Viśveśvara, 154
viṭ, 63 66
Vivādaratnākara, 139n
Vividhatīrthakalpa, 106n
vohāra, 102
vraja, 153
Vṛddhahārīta Smṛti, 125n, 150
Vṛnda, 19
Vṛndamādhava, 19, 24
Vyāsa, 14, 16
vyasana, 201
vyavahāra, 7, 17, 114, 125, 126, 127
vyavahāramātṛkā, 126
Vyavahāramayūkha, 126n, 130, 131n
Vyavahāranirṇaya (of Varadarāja), 126n
Vyavahāraprakāśa, 131
vyaya, 160

W

war
    distribution of the spoils of——, 190
    ethical principles of——, 189, 190
    principles of strategy and methods of——, 187
    treacherous——, 188
    types of——, 165
weapons, 184, 186
    amukta——,
    defensive——, 187
    mantramukta——, 184
    mukta——, 186

pāṇimukta——, 184
relative importance of——, 184-5
supernatural——, 186
types of——, 184
yantramukta——, 184
Wilson, H. H., 13

Y

Yadu dynasty, 32
Yājñavalkya 14, 16, 17, 56, 65, 81, 88, 125, 126, 127, 131, 139, 152, 153, 156, 160, 201, 204,
Yājñavalkya Smṛti, 17, 37, 58, 63, 67, 78, 108, 117, 121n, 125n, 127, 128, 130, 134n, 135n, 137, 139, 146, 151n, 155n, 159n, 196n, 205.
Yajurveda, 42, 52, 107
Yama, 16, 32, 80
Yāmunas, 15
yantra, 185
Yaśastilakachampu, 51, 65n, 74, 88, 95, 96, 98n, 104, 114, 117n, 120, 171n, 175, 202
Yaśodhara, 50, 74, 120
Yaśorgha, 50
Yaśovarman, 46, 114
yātrā, 141, 162
Yauvarājyābhiṣeka, 47
Yavanas, 175
Yoga, 7, 23, 24, 42, 143
yogākhya, 16
yogī, 23
yoginīs, 12
Yoginītantra, 12
yuddhajayārṇavīyajyotiṣa, 206
Yudhiṣṭhira, 40, 49
Yugandharas, 15
Yuktikalpataru, 20, 85, 86, 100n, 166n, 174, 180, 182n, 185n, 187
Yuvarājadeva I, 12, 104
—— II, 107

ERRATA

Wherever the words like five-fold, two-fold and the letter *ṁ* occur, they should be read as fivefold, twofold and *ṃ* respectively.

On page	*For*	*Read*
3 line 10	*Mahāpurāṇa*	*Mahāpurāṇas*
5 line 7	third.	third,
5 fn. 1	*Śaṁkarasaṃhitā*	*Śaṅkarasaṁhitā*
6 line 26	(*arthaśāstra*),.	(*arthaśāstra*).
8 line 3	*verbatim*	verbatim
10 line 7	Vaiṣṇavism.	Vaiṣṇavism,
10 fn. 32	*tachchittāstatparāyaṇdḥ*	*tachchittāstatparāyaṇaḥ*
11 line 8	Pīṅgalamata	*Piṅgalamata*
12 line 3	tent h	tenth
14 line 21	*māhendrā*	*māhendra*
16 line 6	tantric	tāntric
18 line 1	*verbatim*	verbatim
19 line 12	,,	,,
19 line 22	*Piṅgala-sūtras*	*Piṅgalasūtras*
21 line 22	above mentioned	above-mentioned
23 line 6	tantric	tāntric
23 line 27	*yogi*	*yogī*
25 line 1	*Bhartṛmitra*	Bhartṛmitra
25 fn. 165	cxlvi-II	cxlvi-ii
25 fn. 166	*Bhand*,	*Bhand*.
26 fn. 173	*rato . . .nāśini*	*tato. . .nāśinī*
27 fn. 6	*svām...suhṛīt..balānī...*	*svām...suhṛt...balāni*
30 fn. 23	*saṁgrāma vijayādikaṃ*	*saṅgrāma vijayādikaṃ*
30 fn. 23	*satataṁ tasmātpāṭhechch*	*satataṁ tasmātpaṭhechcha*
31 fn. 42	*Pṛhtuṃ nṛpaṃ*	*pṛthuṁ nṛpam*
33 line 1	58	53
35 line 35	*chakravarti*	*chakravartī*
35 line 27	*vice-versa*	vice versa
35 fn. 77	a	the
35 fn. 80	*śūdrarāiye*	*śūdrarājye*
36 fn. 82	*Aparārko*	Aparārka
37 line 19	*Saṅkhalikhita*	*Śaṅkhalikhita*
37 fn. 93	*Sankhalikhita*	*Śaṅkhalikhita*
42 line 1	Sūri	Sūri.
42 line 17	*verbatim*	verbatim
45 fn. 168	crownprince	crown prince
46 line 3	*nanda*,	*nanda*.
47 line 30	Rama	Rāma
48 line 14	Hopkins,	Hopkins’

On page	*For*	*Read*
49 fn. 191	*varnāśramābhāramaropya*	*varnāśramābhāramāropya*
49 fn. 191	RR	*RR*
49 fn. 191	*yauvarājye'thva*	*yauvarājye' thavā*
51 line 24	Yaśastilaka	*Yaśastilaka*
52 fn. 208	*balayukṭaḥ*	*balayuktaḥ*
53 fn. 211	*kṛtva*	*kṛtvā*
54 line 4	*(paur-*	*(paura-*
55 fn. 228	*kālaniyamena . .*	*kālāniyamena . . .*
57 line 35	Chandrāpïḍa	Chandrāpīḍa
57 line 36	*arthaśāstra*	*arthaśāstra-*
58 line 16	AM.	A.M.
59 fn. 241	*su(su)*	*su(sa)*
60 fn. 248	*javedbāhyā . . .*	*Jayedbāhyā . . .*
60 fn. 250	*vijayāyānva . . .*	*vijayāyānya . . .*
62 fn. 269	*rajño*	*rājño*
63 line 20	tlieves	thieves
64 line 11	thc	the
65 line 23	Palitana.	Paliṭana
65 fn. 294	*Aparārka*	Aparārka
66 fn. 302	*vayau . . .*	*yayau . . .*
67 line 16	*Purāṇā*	*Purāṇa*
67 fn. 305	Viṣṇu	*Viṣṇu*
67 fn. 305	Mṛchchha.,	*Mṛchchha.,*
68 fn. 313	*verbatim*	verbatim
70 fn. 332	*nrpaḥ*	*nṛpaḥ*
72 fn. 346	*vakṣve'*	*vakṣye'*
73 line 19	Someśvardeva	Someśvaradeva
73 fn. 352	*. . . . śūnyyaniveśa*	*śūnyaniveśa*
73 fn. 357	*bahubhaksakatvā . . .*	*bahubhakṣakatvā . . .*
79 line 8	*vice-versa*	vice versa
82 fn. 5	*amātva*	*amātya*
84 line 20	*jñān*	*jñāna*
84 line 22	*verbatim*	verbatim
84 fn. 30	KNS	*KNS*
85 line 27	ministers,	ministers'
85 fn. 41	*Krtyakalpataru*	*Kṛtyakalpataru*
86 line 13	Kāyastha	*kāyastha*
86 line 15	Tripuri	Tripurī
89 line 4	*Purāṇas,*	*Purāṇas.*
91 line 16	riglt	right
92 line 20	crownprince	crown prince
92 line 22	,,	,,
94 line 9	*Vasiṣṭha*	Vasiṣṭha
102 line 24	*prāḍavivāka*	*prāḍvivāka*
102 fn. 195	*dharma sthīya . . .*	*dharmasthīya . . .*
104 fn. 209	*sakhaikā*	*sākhaikā*
105 fn. 216	*vākyatah*	*vākyataḥ*

On page	*For*	*Read*
106 fn. 227	*kadāchāna*	*kadāchana*
110 line 21	*prāḍavivāka*	*prāḍvivāka*
111 line 7	*brāhmaṇas*	brāhmaṇas
112 fn. 281	*samar-*	*samara-*
113 line 22	makes	make
115 line 3	betel leaf	betel-leaf
115 fn. 302	Georgaphers	Geographers
116 fn. 306	*tāmbūladvya...*	*tāmbūladvaya...*
116 fn. 306	to-day	today
117 fn. 321	*rājalekhaārinaḥ*	*rājalekhahārinaḥ*
120 fn. 346	*puruṣādhiṣṭhād...*	*Puruṣādhiṣṭhāyakād...*
124 line 14	Rāmapāla,	Rāmapāla.
125 fn. 380	*Vṛddhahārita*	*Vṛddhahārīta*
130 line 9	*smṛti*	*Smṛti*
130 fn. 433	*trayah*	*trayaḥ*
133 line 21	of	off
133 fn. 489	Mit.	*Mit.*
134 line 21	hurt.	hurt,
137 line 14	*vice-versa*	vice versa
137 line 15	*Mitā kṣara*	*Mitākṣarā*
139 fn. 556	*Smrti*	*Smṛti*
143 fn. 597	*Harsacharita*	*Harṣacharita*
143 fn. 598	Chandragupta	*Chandra-gupta*
144 fn. 609	*veṣāṁ*	*yeṣāṁ*
147 line 23	*Medhātithi*	Medhātithi
148 fn. 7	*Rājadharmakānḍa*	*Rājadharmakaṇḍa*
149 fn. 12	p. 260-61	pp. 260-61
150 line 3	*Vṛddhahārita*	*Vṛddhahārīta*
150 fn. 24	Svstem	System
152 fn. 36	*pañchasadbhāgo*	*pañchaṣaḍbhāgo*
155 fn. 64	*Raghuvamśa*	*Raghuvaṁśa*
158 fn. 101	*...tāgnayah*	*...tāgnayaḥ*
159 fn. 108	*Smṛti-Saṁdar*	*Smṛti-Saṁdar-*
160 fn. 110	*svāchchhu...*	*syāchchhu...*
168 line 9	ther	the
169 line 28	Rashidu-d-din	Rashidu-d-Din
171 fn. 69	*Hastyāurveda*	*Hastyāyurveda*
173 line 21	suppor	support
177 line 9	Kṣhatriyas	Kshatriyas
185 line 30	*kṣepani*	*kṣepaṇī*
190 line 18	share of the	share in the
192 fn. 268	*kārṇā...*	*kārāṇā*
196 fn. 299	*Bāhaspatyasūtra*	*Bārhaspatyasūtra*
199 line 8	*Visṇu-*	*Viṣṇu-*
199 fn. 327	*hāvana*	*hāyana*
201 line 7	nean	mean
204 last line	Ṣaṁkarāchārya	Ṣaṅkarāchārya

Appendix :—

On page	*For*	*Read*
55 line 27	*Sundarkāṇḍa*	*Sundarakāṇḍa*
55 line 31	*Upaniṣadas*	*Upaniṣads*
55 line 35	*Bṛhadānaṇyakopaniṣad*	*Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*
55 line 37	*Īśāvaśyopaniṣad*	*Īśāvāśyopaniṣad*

Bibliography :—

55 line 21	Photo Stat copy, Ms. cat. no. 4200 ?	Mss No. 848 and G. 1586.
63	Mac Crindle	Mc Crindle
63 last line	Majundar	Majumdar
65 line 10	Sachan	Sachau
66 line 20	1958	1858

Dr. B. B. Mishra received his higher education in the Patna College and the Department of Public Administration and Local Government, Patna University. He has inherited a genuine love for Sanskrit from his grandfather and father. Since 1954 he is employed as a Lecturer in History in the Government Sanskrit College, Ranchi (affiliated to the Kameshwar Singh Sanskrit University, Darbhanga) and is a member of the Bihar Educational Service.

South East Asia—Prof. S. B. Mukherjee. A Study of Socio-Economic, Political & Cultural Problems and Prospects.	Rs. 20.00

The author with a first hand knowledge of South-East Asia where he has taught for years focuses attention on its problems and gives a brief but very readable account of its lands and peoples and of the problems faced by it. The volume has the following chapters— South-East Asia General, India and South-East Asia, China and South-East Asia, Indo-Indonesian Relations, Problems of Education, Economic Problems, Problems and Prospects of Democracy, Cold war, Chinese Minority, Indian Minority, Malayasia, Whither South Vietnam ? Bali-the Isle of Gods, Social and Cultural Problems and Suggestions for Improvement of Indo-Indonesian Relation etc.

The Vishnu-Purana, a system of Hindu Mythology and Tradition—Wilson, H. H.	Rs. 60.00
Matsya-Purana, a study (an exposition of the Ancient Purana Vidya—Agrawala, Dr. V. S.	Rs. 30.00
Agni-Purana, a study—Gyani, Dr. Dr. S. D.	Rs. 25.00
Subject Index to the Agni-Purana, with important proper names—Bhattacharyya, Dr. R. S.	Rs. 8.00
Cultural Heritage of Kashmir, a survey of Kashmir's contribution to Sanskrit Literature —Banerjee, Dr. S. C.	Rs. 12.00
Dharma-Sutras, a study in their origin & Development—Banerjee, Dr. S. C.	Rs. 40.00
Age of the Rgveda—Law, Dr. N. N.	Rs. 15.00
Vaisnavism Saivism, and Minor Religious Systems —Vandarkar, Sir R. G.	Rs. 10.00
Nineteenth Century Bengal, aspects of social history —Sinha, Dr. P.	Rs. 15.00
An Introduction to Buddhist Esoterism —Bhattacharyya, Dr. B.	Rs. 30.00
Socio-Religious Condition of North India (700-1200 A.D.) based on Archaeological Scurces—Upadhyay, Dr. V.	Rs. 25.00
History of Central Asia, Bronze Age (2000 B. C.) to Chengiz Khan (1227 A.D,) —Mahapandita Rahula Sankritayayana	Rs. 20.00